

Janice K. Brewer
Governor

Bill Feldmeier
Interim Executive Director



Board Members

Walter D. Armer, Jr., Vail, *Chair*
Maria Baier, State Land Commissioner, *Vice Chair*
Alan Everett, Sedona
Larry Landry, Phoenix
William C. Scalzo, Phoenix
Tracey Westerhausen, Phoenix
Reese Woodling, Tucson

MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING
of
THE OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE ADVISORY GROUP
(OHVAG)
of
THE ARIZONA STATE PARKS BOARD

Notice is hereby given pursuant to A.R.S. §41-511.22 to members of the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group (OHVAG) and the general public that the Group will hold a meeting open to the public on **Friday, June 1, 2012, at the Arizona State Board Room, 1300 W. Washington St., Phoenix, AZ at 10:00 a.m.**, pursuant to A.R.S. § 41-511.22. **Attendance via teleconference is available by dialing 1.877.820.7831 and entering the code number 613038.** The Group may go into Executive Session for the purpose of obtaining legal advice from the State Parks Assistant Attorney General on any of the agenda items. pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431 et seq. Items on the Agenda may be discussed out of order, unless they have been assigned a time certain. Public comment will be taken. The Group will discuss and may take action on the following matters:

MINUTES

(The Chair reserves the right to set the order of the agenda.)

A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

CHAIR SAVINO: I'd like to call to order the Arizona State Parks Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group meeting on this Friday, June 1, 2012. The time is – let's call it 10:05 a.m.

B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS AND STAFF

CHAIR SAVINO: Introduction of staff. I'd like to first of go with our OHVAG members. I'm John Savino. I'm from Navaho County, Chairman.

MR. FRENCH: Don French, uh, Mohave County.

MS. ANTLE: Rebecca Antle, Pima County, Arizona State Association of Four-Wheel Drive Clubs.

MR. PFEIFER: Yeah, Pete Pfeifer. I'm from Pima County. I'm representing the AMA, American Motorcycle Association.

CHAIR SAVINO: Let it be known that there's two members that are absent, David Moore and Thomas McArthur. So with that we have a quorum. I'd like to have the staff that's present introduce themselves. Doris?

MS. PULSIFER: I'm Doris Pulsifer, Chief of Resources and Public Programs.

MR. BALDWIN: Robert Baldwin, Recreational Trails Grants Coordinator.

MR. ENNIS: Kent Ennis, Deputy Director, Arizona State Parks.

MR. MARTIN: Brian Martin, Director of Arizona State Parks.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, thank you very much. With that, Brian would you – you're the new director. I would like to – if you'd like to get up and say a few words, I'd appreciate it.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, MR. Chairman. Brian Martin, Director of Arizona State Parks. I wanted to just give a quick welcome to the organization and let you know that Arizona State Parks is committed to continuing a positive relationship with the OHV community. There are a number of issues out there in the state relative to initiatives, budgets and the like. At this point all I can do is let you know that we remain committed to the OHV community. I encourage you to remain committed to our relationship as well and we'll work together to ensure we get the resources to the places that they need to go.

That's the basics. We're on board. We're with you and please take that message back to your users and our producers out there, our people who make a living off this. We're committed to keeping it going in a responsible, predictable manner throughout Arizona. We'll work through the challenges as long as we work together. Thank you.

CHAIR SAVINO: Thank you. Is there any comment from the Board you'd like to address?

MR. PFEIFER: I just wanted to say, hi. My name is Pete Pfeifer and thanks for introducing yourself and for meeting with us.

MR. MARTIN: And thank you to the volunteers that are here driving up from Tucson and the eastside of the state, the north state, to your commitment to OHV. I hope your members realize the sacrifices that you do make on their behalf.

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, thank you very much.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, again.

D. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

CHAIR SAVINO: Call to the public – I have – Jimmy are you – I don't have any sheets in front of me.

MR. SIMMONS: I'm just here to help answer questions.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Thank you and you're with RideNow?

MR. PETROVICH: RideNow Powersports – [unintelligible].

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, Matt, I would like to have you fill out a sheet, if you would. They're over there on the table when you get a chance. So when it does come time – Jimmy, you, too. Just follow – go along with the format – when it comes time. That way we can keep everything going right.

E. CONSENT AGENDA

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, Consent Agenda items. – we're getting ready to review and approve the minutes from September 16, December 11, 2011; January 10, 2012, February 11, 2012, and April 6, 2012. I would like to lump all these together. If you have – just go through them and if you have any questions on any of these minutes, please tell us what the date is and we can go from there. Pete?

MR. PFEIFER: I was just going to say it's a lot to digest in a short period of time. You know, I've reviewed the minutes from the last meeting; but I haven't had a chance to review the other ones.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Don?

MR. FRENCH: Yeah, I've only been through three of 'em myself. That's a lot of – a lot to go through in the short time that we've had them. So, I don't know how you want to approve them all or the ones we've gone through?

CHAIR SAVINO: Rebecca, do you have any comments?

MS. ANTLE: I don't – the only comment I have is – uh – are we approving all of these because they weren't approved at previous meetings?

CHAIR SAVINO: We haven't reviewed them at any previous meetings. When I've asked Bob about that he just didn't have the time – so many other things going on – to get these – as they would be, you know, handled. They fixed this – remedied this problem. Somebody, as you know, is behind us recording these minutes now and they'll be handed to us on a timely manner.

MS. ANTLE: So, Bob are we going to go back to the way then it pretty much was where we get the minutes prior to the meeting and then we can discuss any issues at the next OHVAG meeting and then approve them that way, like we used to do a couple years ago?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair, Ms. Antle, well, that would be the ideal situation, as long as we have somebody to help us get these things created in a timely fashion. What I might suggest then is if you've all read the April 6 meeting, you might just start one at a time and say, "who's read it, who's satisfied with it and" – I mean, they're on a Consent Agenda which means that you have to pull them off a Consent Agenda in order to discuss them. So you might just go ahead and take them all off the Consent Agenda and discuss them one at a time, and if everybody's read the same ones, then they can do those. If you haven't read them, then we'll bring 'em back to the next meeting.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I'd like to at this time take them all – remove 'em all from the Consent Agenda Items. and review. We'll go to the first one, the last meeting that we had most familiar to us is April 6, 2012. Does anybody on the Board have a question on or comments on these minutes?

MR. FRENCH: Didn't read it. Started at the past and started –

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Do you have any?

MR. PFEIFER: Just one comment and that was that, as these grants were coming forward, I noticed a lot of them didn't have the support of an OHV organization – no sponsor letter and stuff like that. I'd really like to see that be more of a – something that's more desirable in these grant requests coming forward.

CHAIR SAVINO: But that wouldn't be in part of these minutes. These minutes – all we're doing here – and we have to catch ourself [sic] on this – we have, as you can see, I have notes after notes on these – all these minutes; but what we're doing here is just approving –

MR. PFEIFER: What was stated –

CHAIR SAVINO: What was stated . . .

MR. PFEIFER: Okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: . . . in these minutes. And then we'll get to the other part later. So as far as the April 6 meeting, Rebecca, do you have any comments?

MS. ANTLE: No.

CHAIR SAVINO: No. Don?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I do. I'd like to question why the legality of this – back on – if you look on these minutes for April 6, on page three at the bottom, I stated that – if you go down I was questioning MR. Baldwin on the travel expenses that State Parks had listed on their – their sheet. Bob goes down – if you look at the bottom he says after my question about it he says, "I'd have to check that out with the budget staff. I'm not sure what they spent it on" – which is understandable. Chairman Savino states, "Okay, would you please do that and report to us at the next meeting?" Mr. Baldwin's reply was, "I will do that." Then we come over to the next page, page four. If you look on there it was added what Mr. Baldwin – Mr. Baldwin presumably contacted Myron Snider from State Parks budgets. Well this – what I have a question on is this was added. This wasn't part of the minutes. Is this legal doing it this way where it was added? How come we approve something that was Bob's – he promised to get back to us on it and all this is is just an addition that he had a conversation other than at our meeting. I don't feel that this is legal to do it this way.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and group, you're correct. We're not supposed to add things to the minutes, so this will be deleted from these minutes before we declare them as final. I would suggest that since you haven't all read these, there's really no way that you can approve 'em, particularly for Becky, since she has – wasn't even in attendance at most of these meetings.

MS. ANTLE: Can I make a suggestion? I don't mean to interrupt, but since Bob – since John has all these little comments on these meetings – on the minutes, would it be possible between all of us in email to do – discuss those?

MS. PULSIFER: No.

MS. ANTLE: We can't do that?

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, well I asked you to review the minutes and send me any corrections or comments and I didn't get any response from anyone. So if over the next period of time you'd like to do that, then I can compile all that stuff and send them out to you prior to the final approval.

MS. ANTLE: Can we do that?

CHAIR SAVINO: Let me do something right away, though, before I get too far. I should have done this at the beginning. Let's do this for the benefit – for this next couple meetings, for the benefit of our person taking the minutes, let's introduce ourselves. Say your name beforehand so she knows who – you know, who's saying this so we can get a better idea on that stuff. Now, on this stuff, so we don't get too carried away, these – that was the only time on all five of these that I actually have a question about something that – about the minutes themselves, what we're doing here as far as approving them. The rest are just things that we'll require – will, you know, cover some of the issues that we have later on when we get to the rating form and what have you. So I don't have any other, you know . . .

MS. ANTLE: Okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: . . . any issues with that. I was just wondering about that addition and we just handled that. So, with that said, is there any more on April 6?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: No? So . . .

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair, this will be my response to you at the next meeting on that question you had on April 6, so . . .

CHAIR SAVINO: I don't think you can do that right now. We're in the process – don't give me your response yet, please. So we can get through with real quick and get it done. All we're doing is – I'm approving these minutes. I'd like to entertain a motion to – to approve the minutes for the April 6, 2012 meeting. Do I have a motion?

MR. PFEIFER: Yeah, I'd like to make a motion to approve the meetings for the – minutes from the meeting on April 6, with the removal of the information . . .

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, great! Is there a second?

MS. ANTLE: I'll second.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, it's been moved and seconded – Pete Pfeifer and Rebecca Antle was the second on it. Okay, all those in favor?

MR. FRENCH: Can I abstain? I didn't read it.

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, if he abstains . . .

MR. PFEIFER: Then, we don't have a quorum.

CHAIR SAVINO: . . . then we don't have a quorum.

MR. FRENCH: We have a quorum – we can have a quorum . . .

MR. BALDWIN: It's a majority of the . . .

MR. FRENCH: . . . people here.

MR. BALDWIN: . . . members present.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, then let's do it that way, then, just to get it done. As far as reading it –

MR. BALDWIN: You have to have a quorum to do business; but a majority of the members present will decide on issues.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, we have a motion and a second on the floor. Discussion has already been handled. All those in favor, say aye.

CHORUS OF VOICES: Aye.

MR. FRENCH: I'll go aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: So we have four ayes, okay? So that's been approved on that. Remember again we're just talking about the actual minutes, not anything – the content of the minutes. Okay, let's go on to February 10, 2012. Is there any comment from any of the Board members on that?

[No, verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: No? I will make the motion this time. I move that we approve the minutes for the meeting on – held on February 10, 2012.

MR. FRENCH: This is Don French, I second.

CHAIR SAVINO: All those in favor?

CHORUS OF VOICES: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: Four ayes, so that's been approved. We're going to go to the January 11, 2012 minutes. Are there any comments on these minutes?

MR. FRENCH: January 11th?

CHAIR SAVINO: January 11, 2012 – is that what I said? Any comments on the actual?

MR. FRENCH: I got a grammatical . . .

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes?

MR. FRENCH: . . . spelling involved.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, that's part of it.

MR. FRENCH: On the first page, "Mr. French: I'm Don French, White Fountains Open Trails Association," it's supposed to be "White Mountains."

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, with that said, is there any other comment?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: So, I'd like to entertain a motion. Is there a motion out there?

MS. ANTLE: I make the motion to accept the minutes of – which one is that, September?

CHAIR SAVINO: January 11th.

MS. ANTLE: January 11th.

CHAIR SAVINO: Second?

MR. FRENCH: I'll second, Don French.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. All those in favor?

CHORUS OF VOICES: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: Four ayes. Go on to Thursday, December 1, 2011. MR. French, do you have any comments on this?

MR. FRENCH: No, comment.

CHAIR SAVINO: Rebecca?

MS. ANTLE: No.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, with that, I will make the motion. I'd like to move to approve the minutes for Thursday, December 1st, 2011.

MR. PFEIFER: Pete Pfeifer, I'll second it.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, it's been moved and seconded. All those in favor?

CHORUS OF VOICES: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: It's been passed, so you know, things can move fast. It's not always slow with me; and I'm not moving my hands to talk about – one more – September – the issue is approval of the minutes for the September 16, 2011 OHVAG meeting. Any comments?

MR. ANTLE: Nope.

MR. PFEIFER: I'd like to make a motion that the minutes for the September 16, 2011 meeting be approved.

MR. FRENCH: I second.

CHAIR SAVINO: Seconded by Don French. All those in favor?

CHORUS OF VOICES: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, it's been carried, unanimously. So, that takes care of the minutes.

F. ACTION ITEMS

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, item – on your agenda Item F(2): "OHVAG will consider –

MR. FRENCH: You want to read the Mission Statement?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes, I – let me – I’ve been jumping ahead of myself. I’m going to back up a little bit and I’m going to read the Mission Statement for this Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group. “The Statewide OHV Program Mission is to develop and enhance statewide off-highway vehicle recreation opportunities, and develop educational programs. that promote resource protection, social responsibility, and interagency cooperation.” Okay? Go to agenda item F(2). “OHVAG Will Consider Funding the OHV Ambassador Program Expansion Grant.” The one OHV Ambassador Program Expansion grant application was received and evaluated by staff. The Group will review and take action on the staff recommendation. This is in regards to the RideNow Corporation’s application for – to be part of the Ambassador Program.

This is – I have to mention that this is part of the \$60,000 -- \$15,000 each, per each grant for four grants that was approved by us at the last May meeting. So that’s part of that. That doesn’t take in consideration – anything going forward. So, is there any comment, questions? I’ll start off with Pete. Do you have anything on this grant?

MR. PFEIFER: I’m glad to see a manufacturer organization getting involved with the Ambassador Program. RideNow is going to be furnishing equipment?

CHAIR SAVINO: Let’s get – would you like to – I’d like to have you step forward and give me a – Matt? Matt Petrovich, he’s representing the RideNow Motor Sports Corporation. He’s the writer of the grant application, so, let’s address any questions we have towards him. Go ahead, Matt.

MR. PETROVICH: I was just having a hard time hearing you, what was that? Sorry.

MR. PFEIFER: Yeah, I was wondering what is RideNow going to bring to the Ambassador Program.

MR. PETROVICH: Basically, help to get the education and awareness out there about the OHV programs, do it in conjunction with our – our dealerships will be able to provide it to our customers, take it to our off-site events and – basically, I mean, the main goal is to get the education out there and just the communication in a consistent format for people.

MR. PFEIFER: Great! So, if I go to the RideNow dealership in Tucson I’ll see some information about the Ambassador Program there?

MR. PETROVICH: Correct.

MR. PFEIFER: Beautiful. Okay.

MR. PETROVICH: Yep.

MS. ANTLE: In reading the grant, the only question I had was I notice that lately we seem to be concentrating a lot on Rio ** Ranch Road; and you have some fence – possible fence work, cleanup and all that stuff. Have you contacted any of the groups down in Tucson?

MR. PETROVICH: Not at this point.

MS. ANTLE: Being as we adopted – Tucson Rough Riders have adopted Rio ** Ranch Road – we do a cleanup yearly and we do maintenance out there. I think any of these areas that you actually go to, you should maybe try to contact the groups in the area so that you can be in conjunction with what they're doing. 'Cause we do it with the Game and Fish. So that would be something that we could do together.

MR. PETROVICH: Perfect!

MS. ANTLE: That was the only comment I had.

MR. PETROVICH: Yep, that's what we're going to do.

CHAIR SAVINO: Is your intent, Matt, too – when you go into an area, since you're a dealership – when you go into an area to do any particular work that you will contact the local?

MR. PETROVICH: Without a doubt. Any organization that we can get ahold of we'll team up with them and just kind of help out the situation; and we're also open for other areas – I mean, looking for other suggestions on different areas that need to be hit, maybe improvements that need to be made. But, yeah, we appreciate that information.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Don, do you have any questions?

MR. FRENCH: No questions.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I have a couple comments and you know a question added with it. One of my concerns is that I don't want it to be a – when this – the first venture into – with the Ambassador Program, venturing into having a dealer involved with the Ambassador Program, I don't want the focus to be on the dealership having the opportunity to be out to sell, you know, units. I do see it, though. I think it's a blessing if we do get that because what happens is that allows more money to come into the Sticker Program. So it comes back with us. You know, it helps enhance that Sticker Program; but I just don't want the emphasis to be on that, I want it to be on the safety thing and what the Ambassador Program stands for.

MR. PETROVICH: Correct – and I mean it's true. I mean, honestly, a lot of times the first touch point to these consumers that buy the ATVs, that buy the recreational vehicles that go out to these areas – we want to be able to provide the information to them saying, "Okay, this is the location we want you to be at." We don't want a situation where they start making their own trails and disrupting the environment. So that's why we want to be able to educate them on the proper areas to ride and then gear safety – I mean – obviously, yes, we sell the product, we sell all the safety gear; but it's more about the consumer and the value that we can offer to the consumer.

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, that's one thing I've noticed and I'm kind of excited, looking back at the first thing I did when I saw this is well, I wouldn't – I'm not for this. I started looking into it a little bit more and thinking about it. One thing – I used to

sell up at Show Low Motor Sports for – and sell ATVs. One thing I noticed with the sales people was that all they did is focus in on the safety part of it, how to shift the gears, how to get on there, put their helmet on. They didn't focus anything on the environment. If – with the Ambassador Program we are educating them in respecting the environment along this, so, it goes hand-in-hand and it works out good. So -

MR. PETROVICH: Yep.

CHAIR SAVINO: I don't have any other questions. Anybody else have any comments or questions?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: So then I'd like to go to – thank you very much, Matt. I appreciate it.

MR. PETROVICH: Yep.

CHAIR SAVINO: Please go to – let me get it.

MS. ANTLE: Page four.

CHAIR SAVINO: Page three. Okay? Would somebody – Rebecca, would you please? Recommended motion?

MS. ANTLE: Recommended motion. "I move to approve funding of \$15,000 from the Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund to RideNow Management, LLLP, to operate an OHV Ambassador Program unit as identified in the OHV Ambassador Program Manual and in compliance with the terms. of the OHV Ambassador Program Expansion Grant Manual and the agreement with State Parks."

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, is there a second to that?

MR. PFEIFER: Pete Pfeifer, I'll second it.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. We don't have to read that off to them every time – the second? You don't need to have the second read off, do you, on the motion?

REPORTER: No.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, you're okay with that?

REPORTER: I'm fine.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, great! So it's been – the motion's been put on the floor. It's been seconded. All those – any discussion on it?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. All those in favor?

CHORUS OF VOICES: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: Four ayes, no nays. Welcome aboard.

MR. PETROVICH: Thank you.

CHAIR SAVINO: Good luck. Let's go to F(4), item F(4). What are we going to do, Bob, with the – what are we going to do when we get through this in such a hurry?

[Laughter.]

CHAIR SAVINO: And then we have that lunch break.

Okay, item F(4): "OHVAG Will Review Statewide OHV Program Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2012 to Discuss Allocation for 2000 – Fiscal Year 2013. Staff will provide information on the use of Fiscal Year 2012 funds. The Group will be asked to identify uses of available funds that should be considered in the budget presented to the Parks Board on June 20, 2012." I – who on staff would like to take care of this? Okay, Doris.

MS. PULSIFER: Can you hear me? Okay, what I've prepared is an exercise just to serve as a visual for you. It's actually pretty simple. I've provided you with some markers there in front of the table and some colored paper. As you know, in the month of June is when the Board will adopt the budget. Usually by this point OHVAG has made some recommendations. So we need to get a recommendation to the Board as to what – what you want for the use of the OHV funds.

So, I thought what we would do to serve as a visual so that you can all kind of see what the outcome is of what your ideas are. This is to provide you with – so that you can provide your ideas and your own – each one – give an opportunity for each one to have some input as to what you think the money should be used for and how you feel it should be prioritized, and how much should go for each section. So I started out – and let me explain this one a little bit – the OHV Ambassador Program – if you read your report, the recommendation from staff to you is that we operate this – award the grants in conjunction with the regular project grants.

CHAIR SAVINO: Now, Doris, you're talking about – this is John Savino – you're talking about the Expansion Grants alone, not the funding for administrative costs?

MS. PULSIFER: Right. This – so this is for – the recommendation – and I don't know – I'll read it in case you can't see it from that far. "Staff recommends that the OHV Program Expansion be considered in conjunction with project grants so no funds will be requested for separate OHV Expansion Grants." They will all be considered a part of that. The recommendation from staff to you is \$155,200. That is broken out in your – I'm not sure what page that is.

CHAIR SAVINO: It's on page –

MS. PULSIFER: There's an attachment there that shows what that agreement – it has the salaries for the coordinator, you know, the two salaries and then some operating money in there.

CHAIR SAVINO: That's on page 20.

MS. PULSIFER: Okay, that's – that is what that \$155,200 will cover; plus there's a little bit of money there available from RTP, the \$6,000; but right now we're concerned with the OHV Funds. Okay?

In addition to that, the "Statewide OHV Program, State Parks Operating Funds – Staff will continue to purchase and wrap OHV Program trailers for new grant-funded OHV units. Staff may also need to purchase other supplies for OHV Program to maintain consistency. Staff is creating a motorized trail maintenance program similar to the non-motorized program that has been very well received over the past ten years. Crews . . ."

CHAIR SAVINO: I want to stop you there, if I may.

MS. PULSIFER: Go ahead.

CHAIR SAVINO: Can we interrupt you with specific questions? When you say "staff," you're referring to staff – the BLM staff that is paid with – Bob, you're represented on that. That's what you're talking about a staff? You're not talking about just State Parks staff when you're talking about this – these items. here. Correct?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman, group, which items. are you talking about. We have two different things that she mentioned.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right.

MS. PULSIFER: I'm talking about the in-house.

MR. BALDWIN: She mentioned money to fund the Ambassador Program.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Who does that then? What staff does that?

MR. BALDWIN: The Ambassador Program is currently operated through the agreement with BLM, who provides Chris Gammage and Marge Dwyer. Those are the salaries that are recommended in that section of the – for that part of the budget recommendation. The other part of the budget recommendation was for \$50,000 for State Parks in-house projects which would include continuing to provide some of the equipment for the – any Ambassador units that get established through the grant-request process; and staff in that instance is State Parks staff.

CHAIR SAVINO: That's State Parks staff. Okay? All right.

MS. PULSIFER: So this section is to support Bill's projects in-house.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MS. PULSIFER: Okay, so, like I said, this is the staff recommendation to you. Then you have the website outreach program which . . .

CHAIR SAVINO: Let's go back, first, if you don't mind; because we still have some questions. Is everybody clear on this – on the Ambassador portion of this?

MR. PFEIFER: The Ambassador – yeah, the expansion of the trail maintenance program – I'm looking at 18. It says, "The ATVs that were acquired from the

Tonto National Forest will be equipped with sign installation equipment and other support equipment may be necessary for train maintenance.” Okay, so these would be . . .

CHAIR SAVINO: These are the ATVs that we bought back from the Tonto.

MR. PFEIFER: Okay. So those are now Arizona State Parks equipment?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

MR. PFEIFER: They’re going to man these vehicles and send them out all over the state, or, are these guys going to be out . . .

CHAIR SAVINO: Bob, will you please address that?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Pfeifer, those units will be available to Ambassador units who want to do trail work or any clubs that might want to do – support some kind of trail work or – what I’m proposing for the trail maintenance program is to use – we’re going to put out a request for proposals for contractors who wanna sign up and do trail maintenance work, the same as we’ve done with the non-motorized trail people. And, this equipment could be available to them, particularly for signage projects or fence repair programs. It would be equipped specifically for those things.

MS. ANTLE: So is – I think, the ATVs – the question you had was, it is State Parks property now?

MR. BALDWIN: They are State Parks’ property and they can be . . .

MS. ANTLE: Okay.

MR. BALDWIN: . . . loaned to anybody under agreement to use them for trail maintenance.

MR. PFEIFER: And the trails, you’re talking about a motorized trails or –

MR. BALDWIN: Motorized trail maintenance.

MR. PFEIFER: Okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MS. PULSIFER: Any other questions?

CHAIR SAVINO: Don French.

MR. FRENCH: I believe I do. I’m – I’m not understanding this. This funding – suggested funding – for the BLM Agreement, that is just the BLM portion of it? On page 20 is what I have. It’s \$140,000 salary and then operating costs, \$15,200, for a total of \$155,200. Is that the total Ambassador Program operating costs for –

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman and Mr. French, yes. That is the oversight provided by BLM employees, Chris Gammage and Marge Dwyer, to support their – what we call foundation units, the original units which still provide services out in the Boulders, Table Mesa area, Cave Creek Ranger District, [unintelligible] area – they are in charge of those units and get the Ambassadors and coordinate them to do

those units. They also coordinate with all of the partner groups, the CFT and the CREC; and now, with RideNow, to provide training for those units, to provide sport, coordinate activities – coordinate event schedules and provide training for those units. So that’s what they do for that money.

MR. FRENCH: Okay, I understand that. Is there also a State Parks portion of the Ambassador Program?

MR. BALDWIN: No, sir. There is no money in the budget allocated specifically to the Ambassador Program. However, the in-house projects that we mentioned just a minute ago could include materials in support of the Ambassador Program. We’ll continue to buy the trailers. If we need to get any type of materials that they use in their “meet-and-greets” so we can get – buy it consistently for everybody and provide them that way.

MR. FRENCH: And while we’re on that, don’t – how many trailers do we have available right now? We have an excess, right?

MR. BALDWIN: Well we have – we bought four new trailers last year, and we have – the BLM has – uh, the BLM has two trailers and then Cave Creek Ranger District has a trailer. So there are seven currently allocated for the Ambassador Program.

MR. FRENCH: Available to correct expansion right, now how many?

MR. BALDWIN: Well, I have one that’s – at BLM that’s kind of not really assigned to anybody – one of the four that we bought last year. So that’s available to be used in – any place that we have new units.

MR. FRENCH: Will that go to RideNow, probably? Or is that . . .

MR. BALDWIN: It could go to RideNow, correct.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bob, I have a question on that while we’re on that subject. Last year, part of the \$320,000 was \$60,000 for the expansion. You also – and we just covered that a little while ago with RideNow.

REPORTER: Could you adjust your microphone?

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, can you hear me okay?

REPORTER: Yeah.

CHAIR SAVINO: Testing. All right.

Bob, last year we had four trailers and those were appropriated for the four expansion – supposedly, expansion groups that we had out there. We approved the \$60,000, \$15,000 per group. Those trailers were supposed to handle that. Up until today, we didn’t have any of those groups. So there should have been four trailers still sitting there waiting for that use. We used one we approved today for RideNow. That leaves three trailers left that should be carried over. I hate to see – what I heard and I might have misunderstood it, but what you were telling MR. French is that those trailers – BLM had ‘em used for other stuff. There should be a surplus of three trailers sitting there not used right now.

And what I'm afraid of is that – it usually happens if a trailer is sitting there, we had it proposed for something, then it's all of a sudden – it says, "Well, it's an empty trailer. Let's use it for something else." I don't want to see it because then what happens, the next time we have group come forward – the next three groups that come forward asking for an expansion grant and we approve, trailers should have been already taken care of for that because we already purchased them. I don't want us to happen to say, "Well, we don't have any trailers left." So, what's the deal with this?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman and group, those four trailers were bought for the CREC group. One is in Flagstaff and two of 'em were provided to the Community Forest Trust, one in Prescott and one down in Verde Valley. The one – extra one that I mentioned that's sitting at BLM was allotted to them for an additional expansion unit. We looked at the Tonto Basin Area, and that didn't really work out; so – and they're going to start working with Wickenburg and possibly the trailer could get located over there. So there is one trailer sitting right now. It's not directly allocated to anyone.

Look at the first page of that item F(4), it does show you the balance of expenditures and all those appropriations for the last year. The money for the trailers that you're talking about was included in the 2011 budget and of that budget we had \$18,240 left over. And the new budget for 2012 shows the \$60,000 and the one grant for \$15,000 expended so far. So that's the status of the money that was allocated over the last two years to the State Parks' portion of the Ambassador Program.

CHAIR SAVINO: I'd like to table this. Kent? I'd like to recognize Kent.

MR. ENNIS: Those trailers that went – the two trailers you mentioned, [inaudible], are they on temporary loan to [inaudible].

REPORTER: Kent, I'm sorry, you're not on a microphone.

MR. ENNIS: Those two trailers that you mentioned that were designated for those groups, what's their expectation and our expectation of their possession of those?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman and Mr. Ennis, the trailers provided to the CFT were – are provided under our contracted agreement with them for use of – for the three-year period of that project. The trailer at the – in Flagstaff at the CREC is contracted under the agreement with CREC to provide an Ambassador Program in Flagstaff. That is a one-year agreement that's up for expiration in the fall of this year; and the expectation of that is that we will continue to do the – have some kind of presence up in that area, whether it's with CREC or some other program sponsor for a long period of time.

So, the trailers are allocated, strategically, to be available in those areas for OHV – for Ambassador Program activities.

CHAIR SAVINO: I'd like to –

MR. ENNIS: Thank you.

CHAIR SAVINO: Is there anything else, Kent?

MR. ENNIS: That's all.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. I'd like to bring this to attention – this – I'm looking back at the May 2011 minutes; and in there we paid for a six-by-twelve, enclosed Tandem Axle V-Nose Trailer, wood cabinets, spare tire, fire extinguisher, \$8,500. That was a separate investment on our parts and that was to CREC. So at this time, there's some discrepancy on what you stated according to what I'm reading here; and I would like to have you come forward – I mean, at the next meeting, present us with the true numbers on this. Because I don't believe originally going back to when we first appropriated \$75,000 for three expansion grants – we had appropriated the money for – only one group came forward that we approved. That was the Community Forest Trust. That's left two things. At that time you stated that you were going to buy four trailers with the rest of that money; and yet that time you did that, and you stated it in these minutes. So now you're saying that we're doing that and I'd like to have a clearer picture of what's going on here. So if you can – rather than getting into it right now, I'd like to have you present us with the, uh, true accounting of these trailers at our next meeting.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and group, at our – those trailers weren't purchased with any of the funds allocated to State Parks. They were purchased with the admin portion of the funds that was remaining at the end of last year. So they didn't even come out of the \$75,000 that was given. They were purchased . . .

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, then –

MR. BALDWIN: . . . from our admin portion.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, and Bob, that's fine. Whatever you come up with I've asked you to report back to us at the next meeting on the true accounts of this and then we'll take it from there. But – so we don't cover up too much of the time here. Are there any other questions on this – these fundings for the budget on the Ambassador Program?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: No, okay. The floor is yours again, Doris.

MS. ANTLE: I have –

CHAIR SAVINO: Oh!

MS. ANTLE: I have a question. Do we have – I saw Marge Dwyer, actually, twice last month. Do we have an accounting of how well those trailers are doing? I mean, as far as the amount of people they're getting in – I don't know how we would get that information – just to know how well the Ambassador Program's actually working? Does Marge keep records like that? I think she does.

CHAIR SAVINO: They should – well, go ahead, Bob.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman and group, they do keep statistics of all the events, the number of contacts. I think we provided some of that information to you as I get it from them. This last weekend they provided information about contacts at the Mormon Lake Lodge and also one other event up there in northern Arizona and the number of contacts that they made there. They give you our – we give you our annual – yearly statistics of all of the events and contacts, statistics of fence repairs, trail maintenance done, and hours of volunteer time – all that kind of stuff on an annual basis; but it is available on a regular basis.

MS. ANTLE: Okay. I was just wondering how well the program was working, how they felt it was working. I guess I could get ahold of Marge and . . .

CHAIR SAVINO: We have –

MS. ANTLE: . . . ask her.

CHAIR SAVINO: And we have – occasionally, we have them come to us and give us a presentation on that; and I'd like to also recommend that at our next meeting we have that – have them come forward and give us an update on what's going on.

MS. ANTLE: That would be – I think I'd like that. Just to know how well the program's going.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, but for this time being, I'd like to concentrate back on – because we're under time constraints, to talk about the budget going forward for this; so, are there any other questions on the Ambassador Program pertaining to the budget for this next year?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: I did notice that it's down from – if I'm reading this – I have a question on this on – you state – you have there where Chris Gammage is \$65,000. That's for his . . .

MR. FRENCH: Salary?

CHAIR SAVINO: . . . admin – his salary on that. That's not an increase from last year. That's the same. But there's a \$10,000 increase – do we only have one person from the Advance Resource Solutions working for – under this project at the time, Bob?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman and group, yes. That's Marge Dwyer and she's billed hourly through the contractor, Advance Resource Solutions.

CHAIR SAVINO: So, if I'm reading this right, she went from \$65,000 last year to – she has a \$10,000 increase or the Advance Resource Solutions has a \$10,000 a year increase from last year's. Correct?

MR. BALDWIN: Correct.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay and then I see the last year – so we're basically coming – last year the funding for this which included the expansion grants that we went into CREC with was \$320,000 and some change. This year it's \$301,200. So we're less than what we had for their operating costs than we had last year. Correct?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: All I did is add up those and I came up and compared it to last year's three hundred and thirty . . .

MR. FRENCH: Where you coming up with that?

CHAIR SAVINO: The other? From looking back at the last year's minutes.

MR. FRENCH: No, I'm asking – I asked Bob if that's the total amount for the Ambassador Program . . .

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, I'm adding in – because we still – even though we separated it on the RTP funds, it's still money that could be there. So I got \$150,000, \$5,200, plus \$6,000 from the RTP money. It comes to \$161,200 plus the \$140,000 – or am I getting that wrong?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman?

MR. FRENCH: You're getting it wrong.

MR. BALDWIN: From the total requested for the Ambassador Program this year is a hundred – from the Off-Highway Vehicle Fund is \$155,200.

MR. FRENCH: That's what I got.

MR. BALDWIN: Last year's appropriation for the same services through BLM was \$163,800.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I had it wrong, I'm sorry. But – okay, sounds good!

MR. FRENCH: I'm very glad to see that.

CHAIR SAVINO: And I appreciate it – that we're being able to now, as any new expansions coming forward, that it comes in front of us as far as the grant goes. One recommendation I'd like to have us think about – our Board thinking about is, somewhere along the line this – even though the program, I feel, is a great program and it's being run good, is that somewhere along the line we need to think about where to put a percentage on it. Say that 15 percent – I'm just throwing out numbers – 15 percent of our entire projects' budget goes towards the Ambassador Program. I hate to see that 90 percent – if we get it – keep going and expanding – that 90 percent of the monies are being used for the Ambassador Program and we only have 10 percent left to put out on the ground.

[End of tape.]

CHAIR SAVINO: . . . we need to somewhere think about maybe putting a cap on it, say 15 percent of the projects' money that we're able to work with are used for the Ambassador program. That also gives the Ambassador folks the opportunity to look back and foresee what our budgets are gonna be next year and then know how to expand from there. So I'd like to have us think about that during the – you know, down the road somewhere.

MR. FRENCH: I think we already do that on a year-to-year basis. We approve the budget most of the time.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right, but we just have to keep that in mind as we're doing it. Rebecca?

MS. ANTLE: Would it be possible – it seems. like the Ambassador Program is going fairly well, and last year – what did we say – so they're asking for \$155,000 for this year? Okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: For "administrative" uses.

MS. ANTLE: Well, my – I kind of agree with what you had to say, but, would it be possible to – I don't know if you're going to like what I have to say – but, make this a reoccurring grant? So that, this is the money, we'd say \$155,000 is what we're going to allot from the beginning of the year for the Ambassador Program for administrative for each year. And until that money – and then they can give an accounting of – well, we didn't it all – but, whatever, but that money is always allotted for Ambassador so we don't have to come back and re-allot that every year. The money may fluctuate a little bit, here and there – you see what I'm trying to say?

CHAIR SAVINO: What is your advantage by doing that?

MS. ANTLE: By them coming – by that money always being there, we don't have to vote on it each time. Can we just make it a reoccurring grant?

MR. PFEIFER: See if the program's working until the program doesn't work.

CHAIR SAVINO: I don't know how that's gonna be possible and if it's feasible. Because, let's say they get another – this year they get out and work and it catches on and there's 15 expansions that are out there.

MS. ANTLE: Then they'd have to come back with an expansion; but this is what they're given.

CHAIR SAVINO: No, no, the expansions would be a separate deal because that comes in front of us.

MS. ANTLE: Right. Yeah.

CHAIR SAVINO: But as far as the administrative costs, the fact that they allude to it in one of these – in a comment here somewhere that they're – they are anticipating coming back to us with another program coordinator's position. So as they get – they expand, they'll come to us with another coordinator's position. That'll add that to that \$155,000.

MR. PFEIFER: This is a program that's still –

MS. ANTLE: It's in its infancy.

MR. PFEIFER: Right.

MS. ANTLE: But it's working; and if they know that they have this money available –

MR. PFEIFER: Uhm hum.

MS. ANTLE: At the start of the year they know they can allocate that money, and if they have something else, above and beyond that, they can come back with that later on.

CHAIR SAVINO: The only thing I'm afraid of in this whole process is that it gets – it gets too big to carry the weight and we get too top-heavy – that we have too many administrators out there. All of a sudden it's a one-on-one, you know, ratio instead of, you know, whatever it is.

And I would like to question Bob on something. A while back – several times in the past – years – you mentioned that you foresee this Ambassador Program someday possibly taking on its own roots. Is that – can you allude to that or is that a – have you forgotten about that? I mean, is that a dead issue?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman and group, ideally – and you've touted this all along – that it should be supported by the user community. So, what we would ideally like to see is some type of foundation, or club, or something, take over the whole thing and provide leadership, the same leadership that we have basically now, from a nonprofit or a non-governmental situation. And so until somebody comes up with that idea, or an existing group out there decides to adopt the program to that extent, then it's hard to say.

And, I mean, obviously, a nonprofit could go out and raise funds through all different types of ventures, and apply for other grants, or whatever they might do; but they would have the same responsibility, basically, that Chris and Marge do right now as overseeing from the top; and there would still be units out there that they would coordinate for.

CHAIR SAVINO: So, what you're basically saying – if I understand you right – is you take it – you foresee it going ideally to a thing like the Arizona Off-Highway Vehicle Coalition? It's a nonprofit organization. And it's run and it's taken out of the government's hands. If they want to apply for a grant to assist on some of this, they can do it; but it's run by, you know, the peer groups that are out there?

MR. BALDWIN: That would be an example of a working situation where they would come to you and request X dollars a year to operate the Ambassador Program. It would be, you know, essentially the same kind of money; but it would be given to a nonprofit, user group that's coordinating the – they would – they would still need to be able to maintain relationships with the agencies that obviously . . .

CHAIR SAVINO: Right, I understand.

MR. BALDWIN: . . . we have through BLM.

CHAIR SAVINO: They follow under the guidelines of the Ambassador Program. What it is – and what I – and I have talked to Bob about this – and what it does it – and why I wanted to bring it up – is it puts a light at the end of the tunnel, per se. That we're not looking at – that ten years down the road that all of a sudden we have \$5 million going out to the Ambassador Program; that it could take on

its own legs down the road. So what we're doing is helping stimulate it and get it going along the way. So, is there any questions on that at all, Don?

MR. FRENCH: I've got one more question. I guess I'm confused. Last year we paid for a coordinator for CREC; and that's not in the budget this year? Am I understanding that right?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman, Mr. French, you're correct. There's no appropriation in there. The – their contract ran from July-to-July, but they actually put the coordinator, Robert Klein, on part-time or leave for the winter season because he was – they weren't actively participating. So that will extend the time that they have – the money that they have available to employ him on through the rest of this summer. So – and we'll look at bringing another request to you, possibly, at the end of the summer if that needs to be extended.

CHAIR SAVINO: Will that be part of – we're looking at the budget for fiscal year 2013 which will take into consideration the end of the summer. Shouldn't that kind of be considered into the budget, then, instead of a – it's foreseen that they're going to come to us with this – and it's a good chunk of money – shouldn't we be adding this in there somewhere?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman and group, the proposal is that they would compete for grant fund project money. This is a project just like putting a trail on the ground. It's providing people to provide some maintenance services, to provide on-ground presence in these locations, and it will compete in the same criteria that we're going to go through today as a project and be funded accordingly.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, so – to clear my mind on this. I had thought that what we're doing is we're looking at the budget for the administrative costs, basically, the \$155,000 as administrative costs for fiscal year 2013 for the Ambassador Program. What we had agreed on that – what we're going to talk about is the thing that's going to come in front of us for grants is the expansions. That expansion grant in the past hasn't taken in consideration the administrative costs. That \$15,000 that we're going to approve for an expansion grant that comes forward for a certain club isn't taking in consideration that. So that money should be put into this – this original administrative cost if it's going be considered down the road. Now whether they use it or not, that's a different thing. But we need to consider that right now when we're doing this for the budget.

Because I can't – when it comes forward – when RideNow comes forward, they're not talking about adding in their administrative costs. That's a whole separate deal. So it should be added into this right now.

MR. FRENCH: It looks to me like staff's found a way to show \$70,000 less for the Ambassador Program on the budget. I mean, you're still going to ask for exactly the same thing, though. I thought we were getting a really cool deal here, but you guys have found another way to charge for it, so –

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman and group, the Ambassador units, the Ambassador projects will compete with other projects for the project money. Just like . . .

CHAIR SAVINO: But we're not – we're talking about two different things. I don't think it's fair to go forward with this and say that – here, we're putting through \$155,000 for administrative costs, but we're – in truth we're not. Because they're going to come back and you know – that you just stated the end of this summer they're going to probably come back with another \$75,000 for a coordinator's position, plus any more they have. Now we have to look at that. That should be figured in right now, which gives you a clearer picture of this. Like Don just said that we're – we saw that – the way you have it listed here, \$155,200 for administrative costs. Well, we felt that's great! It came down from \$165,000. But in reality, when you add in the \$75,000 at the end of the summer, it's going to take it way above that. It's not right.

MR. BALDWIN: Chairman and group, you have \$2.3 million sitting in the bank right now.

CHAIR SAVINO: Don't go back to that of where we have . . .

MR. BALDWIN: You have \$500,000 in projects that you may approve today. The money is sitting. It's not getting out the door.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bob.

MR. BALDWIN: These Ambassador projects are on equal level, it's competing for the funds to get OHV projects completed. And OHV projects can include education efforts, all of the categories that are in the statute to be provided for projects.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bob, all I'm asking you is to be fair and have a clear picture and have an honest picture. Every time I've talked about it when we corner staff on this subject it comes back that, "Mr. Chairman, you have two point such-and-such sitting in a fund, or whatever it is; and if you don't use it you're gonna lose it." I'd rather lose it than to send it to somewhere where it's not – where we don't feel it should go. I'm not saying that it shouldn't be used here. I'm just saying put it up here to start with.

MS. PULSIFER: And I think, you know, we tried to be clear on that in that we're saying the OHV Program Expansion be considered in conjunction with project grants. All we're trying to do is to separate this portion of the BLM Ambassador Program separate and then the grants, as Bob explained, they'll be considered in conjunction 'cause we do have a lot of money, we need to get it out the door; and if they're eligible projects they have to meet the criteria according to the State Trails Plan and the OHV statute.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, Pete, do you have –

MR. PFEIFER: Just a quick statement. It sounds like there's still money left in the original funding for this position, so the [unintelligible] came back and said, "This money's coming back to you and later on it'll be going out." So anyway, there's still some money sitting there in the "kitty," it will be used when that guy comes back on board, then they may at a future date come and ask for more

money for administrative costs. But we're aware of it now, so, you know, we can make a – you know, we can have that discussion at that point in time.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Rebecca, do you have any comments on this?

MS. ANTLE: No, I was just going to say, maybe we should look at allocating the \$75,000 for that future coordinator. I mean, we've discussed it. We know it's going to be there. Let's go ahead and put it in there.

MR. PFEIFER: Yeah, but we don't know what the actual figure's gonna be.

MS. ANTLE: We don't. But, you know – on the books – the problem with this, if we don't do something with this money, we will lose it. I mean, let's not just throw it away. We have to find a way to spend it or we're going to get swept, and we are gonna lose the money.

MS. PULSIFER: And part of this exercise is so that you can put your ideas up here and what you suggest and prioritize it. Then we'll come back and we'll see how many people agree and then we'll try to come to a consensus today.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MS. PULSIFER: That's the reason for doing this.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, let's go. Don, you have any questions?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Don, please – you're shaking your head. Please state it rather –

MR. FRENCH: It's getting all convoluted here. But the point is, last year you guys put all your staffing in the – and that's what I thought we were trying to do, come up with a budget for next year. And – why are we budgeting for some of it and not the other? Now all of a sudden you're throwing this – this CREC coordinator into a –

MR. PFEIFER: Grants request?

CHAIR SAVINO: Grants request.

MR. FRENCH: Grants request. I mean, it seems like devious people work for me. Let's put it up front. What's this Ambassador Program gonna cost? And let's – I mean, I don't think anybody's against it; but it's just the way we're going about doing this. It just seems. not on the up-and-up; and let's – let's put it out for what it's gonna cost. I mean, I don't think anybody's got a problem with how much it is, it's just the way we're doing it – or at least, that's my problem with it. So –

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Doris?

MS. PULSIFER: And that's what this exercise is about. I mean, if that's how you feel then you'll put it down on your paper and prioritize it and we'll look at it.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Then please go on – wait, no.

MR. ENNIS: Could I excuse myself for one second?

CHAIR SAVINO: You bet. Go 'head.

MS. PULSIFER: One of the other things that we funded was the website – the outreach for the OHV Program. And through March – uh, okay, let me back up. The amount that was awarded for this particular piece was \$50,000 if you remember. That was awarded last December. So the contract started this year. And so through March they've been billing about \$4,000 a month, so through March we have expended \$16,000 and expect to spend \$4,000 for April, May and June. So, the contract is through December of this year, so, you'll still have some money left from the \$50,000 to take us through the rest of the year; but then that's going to leave us with the last half of next fiscal year that – if you want to continue this website outreach, we need to allocate some money to cover the last half of next fiscal year. So, staff – based on what we've been getting billed, we're recommending \$28,000 for the next fiscal year to cover the last half of the next fiscal year.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, great! Everybody understand that?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Let's go on to your next.

MS. PULSIFER: Okay and then this is just whatever is left from whatever suggestions you have to recommend the rest of the projects. That's all this is.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. That is a flexible figure there.

MS. PULSIFER: You could say "up to," I guess.

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, because we don't know. It depends on what the sticker amount coming in what we're estimating Sticker Funds to be.

MS. PULSIFER: Yeah, exactly – exactly.

CHAIR SAVINO: Is there anything that was given in the past? We've had times when the Board has stated that "You will have X amount of dollars out of this fund that you can use. The rest we're leaving in limbo for a time being in case we may need it for a rainy-day fund or what have you." Have they stated anything like that, Kent?

MR. ENNIS: No, they have not.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MR. ENNIS: So, we're – we're – we have, Mr. Chairman, a little more money this year. We're starting off this year with no sweeps, agency wide. So, uh, we -- that's the best news, I suppose, in five years – maybe six. And so any contingencies or rainy-day funds or things like that, I think, were -- to the extent we have any surpluses or are finding from our general, overall funds, it's certainly nothing that I've heard of, or do I believe will come, in relation to OHV funds.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. One other thing that I didn't see on there that – when you sent out a thing, Doris – a email to us asking us if we had any suggestions for the budget this year; one thing I don't see on there that I put in there was travel expenses. Not just travel, but expenses to promote the Sticker Fund. I had that on there. I don't see that up on the board here.

MS. PULSIFER: Okay, hang on. I had this here, just in case.

CHAIR SAVINO: You know I was gonna bring it up.

[Laughter.]

MS. PULSIFER: Right. On this section – this'll give you the opportunity if you have other – other things that you feel you want to be funded. Now, keep in mind that travel incentives cannot be taken out of aid money. It would have to come out of our regular operating money.

CHAIR SAVINO: Not necessarily. I checked with Representative Weiers last year on this at a meeting. And, what we found out that if we're promoting the Sticker Fund – we're trying to enhance the Sticker Fund Program, then we can use the money. I'm not talking about the money that – for the travel to come here to this meeting, per se. That should come under operating expenses – which I'll get to in a minute on a different issue. But what I'm talking is expenses to go to these various clubs, for instance, and promote the Sticker Fund. To get – there's 400 plus thousand opportunities out there to get sticker – these people with decals. Right now they're not doing it.

One of the things with this Whiplash Racing Organization that I made a deal with them is that I expect to see every vehicle out have the Sticker Fund. So that puts a thousand vehicles that are going to have this sticker on their – on their vehicles. So that's what I'm talking about, allowing us the opportunity to get out there to promote the Sticker Program. That's the money therein. We are legal to do it to take it out of the funds here. The other money, the appropriation for travel for these meetings, it was – the door was opened this last two meetings ago for the State Parks Board. They approved \$3,000 to use of operating expenses for their travel; but yet they still have it to where we can't use any of the money for travel and that's –

MR. ENNIS: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes, Kent.

MR. ENNIS: May I ask a question? With regard to – this is just an educational – for information. With regard to promoting the Sticker Fund, are you talking about this group here or your designees?

CHAIR SAVINO: No, our – this group here want to get out there – well, it could be – it's flexible. What the whole intent is to get out there to promote. When you see a big pot there and we're only tapping into this month – is to get out there to promote this.

MR. ENNIS: And I'm merely asking are we talking about this group?

CHAIR SAVINO: This group, yes. The seven members that are on this group is what we're talking about to get out there.

MS. ANTLE: We were fortunate in the beginning, several years ago – what five or six years ago – to have been reimbursed for our travel; and it came out of our money – out of the OHVAG money.

MR. ENNIS: I understand.

CHAIR SAVINO: Plus you have to understand a few years back that we were also fortunate enough to have four staff members, Amy, Troy, Ruth was on there, and Bob, available to do this stuff. Now we're saying that there's only one pretty much. He's wearing four hats. We want to have that opportunity to go out there and help him do the work. And we're willing to use our money to do that. That's all we're saying. So, that's why I added it on there, Doris.

MS. PULSIFER: One of your other suggestions you've been talking about that would take care of some of those things that you just mentioned.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, that's the one of a full-time employee on staff here? Can I explain that a little bit to this –

MS. PULSIFER: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: What she just put up on the board was – and I've had – made suggestions in the past as I felt – and Kent, please listen to me on this one here. I felt all along that we're putting out money. You see that we're putting out \$65,000 for Chris Gammage, then another \$75,000 for Marge Dwyer. Why not – I just expressed to you that – what we've seen over the years, we go down from four down to one, because staff reduction. Yet we're taking this money from here and sending it across town over there to a federal agency to do that. Wouldn't it make more sense to have that employee – have one or two of those employees here, on staff, working for Bob?

Now, the Ambassador Program doesn't necessarily – isn't necessarily a 24/7 job or, let's say, a 40-hour-a-week job. That person can be used to do other functions regarding – pertaining to the OHV community like getting out there and promoting the stuff we're talking about here. So having those people on staff here bringing it – Chris and Marge are doing a heck of a job over there. Well, bring them over here and put 'em under Bob, under staff here, under Doris and have them work here. Why send the money out to do that? That's where the suggestion came here, of the full-time employee to get that worked out there. So, what you're doing is you're taking that money from over there, basically, and moving it over here under State Parks. So we have – one of the problems. that some of my constituents out there have – I sound like a legislator – my constituents, okay, the people I talk to out there in the community have is – why are we having federal employees running this program? It's a state program. So, that's why it was mentioned there. Any other comments on this?

MS. ANTLE: Can I apply for the job?

[Laughter.]

MS. ANTLE: Just thought I'd ask.

MR. FRENCH: No, we're not adding a job, we're –

CHAIR SAVINO: We're transferring jobs over. Basically, you'd be doing – you'd be taking those jobs and transferring 'em over here under the jurisdiction of Bob.

Okay, go 'head, Doris.

MS. PULSIFER: Okay, so, any questions? Any comments from Bob -- anything you -- anyone else?

[No verbal response.]

MS. PULSIFER: So, the exercise is for you to take – you've got little baskets of paper here. Consider each of these items. up here. Write down how much you feel should be allocated for each item and prioritize it. Is it your – put a number one for your priority one and so on, then come up and just put 'em – your priority one here, then you're going to put your priority one paper here and what your recommendation is.

CHAIR SAVINO: How many priorities are there, total?

MS. PULSIFER: Well we've got – there's –

CHAIR SAVINO: Three?

MS. PULSIFER: Well, depending – I mean, you may have more priorities depending if you've got various recommendations here.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MS. PULSIFER: Okay, so, just write 'em down; prioritize them down here; and then just come up and put them next to where they fall – underneath where they fall, then we'll discuss that.

MR. FRENCH: So you just put priority one, priority two, priority three?

MS. PULSIFER: Yeah, and just put -- put the amounts with it.

MR. FRENCH: How come everybody's got a pen but me?

CHAIR SAVINO: Here, grab one of these.

MR. FRENCH: They didn't give me one.

CHAIR SAVINO: Use a different color than green on a green paper.

MR. FRENCH: Well we have purple, it's gonna be better.

[Pause.]

CHAIR SAVINO: I'm moving it from there over to there. I'm gonna put zero priority on the number one there and I'm moving over to priority one – full-time employee. I'm just moving it from – that's what you want, right? Something like that?

MS. PULSIFER: Yeah, however you feel that – what the priorities are and how much you think should be allocated.

MR. FRENCH: How much?

MS. PULSIFER: Yeah, put the amount.

[Pause.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Then you're gonna ask us our reasoning for this stuff.

[Pause.]

MS. PULSIFER: Let me clarify something. Don't forget that we've got two different issues here. We've got one for the \$155,000 and then we've got the in-house amount for – you know, for the supplies to wrap the trailers and that kind of stuff in the \$50,000.

CHAIR SAVINO: How much was that, fifty?

MS. PULSIFER: This was fifty, so don't forget about this piece here.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

[Pause.]

MS. PULSIFER: Don't forget that this is for a 12-month period. So anything that's not used is gonna be returned to the pot.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right.

[Pause.]

MR. PFEIFER: I have \$2.3 million.

MR. FRENCH: This is for the projects?

CHAIR SAVINO: That's for just anything you – yes – no, that's projects, number three there, okay. This other one is just anything you may come up with. This is – you know, this is what, third-grade level. You have to make these projects – these tasks that you're giving us on a second-grade level from now on.

[Laughter.]

MS. PULSIFER: John, did you mean \$50,000 or \$50?

[Laughter.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Fifty thousand. If I wanna give them \$50. They can buy lunch.

[Laughter.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Would that just fall under regular grant projects?

MR. BALDWIN: That would be under the in-house project grant.

CHAIR SAVINO: Which is the \$50,000?

MR. BALDWIN: Which is the \$50,000 – ATVs with sign materials –

[Overlapping conversations.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Remember this is third grade. You have to do things on the second-grade level for me.

[Board members are deciding on priorities to add to the board. Several side-bar conversations, but no formal discussion.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, go 'head.

MS. PULSIFER: Maybe we should start from the bottom – from the bottom up.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MS. PULSIFER: It looks – from looking at this, the least priority is the website.

CHAIR SAVINO: It seems. pretty clear.

MS. PULSIFER: Yeah, pretty clear. What I'm not clear on – it's not a priority, but we don't have any money allocated – does that mean you wanna discontinue the – the website?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes. And my reasonings for my saying discontinue the website –

MR. FRENCH: Do you wanna do this right now?

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, I don't know. When do you do it?

MR. FRENCH: I don't know. Are you – are we giving comments on this now?

MS. PULSIFER: Well, we should have a reason for –

CHAIR SAVINO: And my – that's why I was gonna state it. [Unintelligible.]

MR. FRENCH: Sure.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, my reasons for that is that – I – when we went into this website program, it was supposed to be a program that was gonna be run by the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group, to get it out there, not just to enhance State Parks' website. I look on there today and I don't see any – any change. We've written – I've written four newsletters, but there's nowhere you can find those newsletters. I don't think we're getting our bang for our buck right now for what it is; and I feel that what it is is a miscommunication between – it's going through State Parks right now, but it has that State Parks' flavor on it; and that's what we were trying to get away from.

So, with that in mind, I feel that at this time it's better to just not fund it anymore and review it at a later date for funding.

MS. PULSIFER: Okay, keep in mind that, you know, you still have the rest of the year with that contract. So –

MR. ENNIS: Until when?

MS. PULSIFER: Until the end of year.

MR. ENNIS: June 30?

MS. PULSIFER: That means – calendar year, December.

MR. ENNIS: It's already paid for?

MS. PULSIFER: Well, we have –

MR. BALDWIN: The contract runs 'til December 1st.

MR. ENNIS: Okay. And it's already paid for?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes. That's paid for. Then it goes on to the –

MR. BALDWIN: Yeah it gets paid for by what was appropriated last year.

MS. PULSIFER: So, if we get to the end of December – between now and December, the issues are worked out and you want to continue it in January, you're not gonna have any money January to the end of next year.

MR. FRENCH: We've got a lot of money.

MS. PULSIFER: Well – I mean but you haven't –

CHAIR SAVINO: Then all we do is we put it in the projects funds as a project for us, like we've done with the – you guys are doing with the staffing. We just throw it in the projects fund. If we fund it – and we agree to fund it – then we're basically – we're extending that contract for the – past December 1st; and before we do that – any extensions, we wanna see that it's going to the right – in the right direction. So how do we handle that?

MR. ENNIS: May I ask a question?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes, Kent.

MR. ENNIS: Were you consulted or discussed these enhancements to the website? Or was this done entirely on our side?

CHAIR SAVINO: What we had originally –

MR. ENNIS: No, but when – when our website was changed, or not, to your view?

CHAIR SAVINO: No, we weren't consulted on that.

MS. ANTLE: Well, I think where John's going with this is that it's a State Parks website; and I think what he would like to see more would be kind of a website, almost – I guess what you're looking at is run by us?

CHAIR SAVINO: Not necessarily run by us –

MS. ANTLE: With more input from us?

CHAIR SAVINO: We have the input on this.

MS. ANTLE: All right.

CHAIR SAVINO: We wanted a – we're paying for this out of projects funding and we wanted to have it to where they wouldn't have to think about, "Well, how do I get information on off-highway vehicles stuff? Well, I go to State Parks." Well

not everybody knows that they don't correlate the two together. In fact, if you go upstairs, Kent, you don't see a doggone thing upstairs saying anything about OHV use. So that's where we're going.

MS. ANTLE: And maybe another thing on the website might be the grants, what it's funded, what we've accomplished over this last – I don't know how many years it's been – to actually see –

CHAIR SAVINO: I put that on my newsletters. Do you get those newsletters?

MS. ANTLE: Yeah, but that should be part of the website. You wanna go to grants. This is what we've done.

CHAIR SAVINO: If you go on there right now – and they've had it for – we put out thirty-some thousand dollars, you can't find that newsletter anywhere.

MS. ANTLE: And the other thing, I think I sent her a bunch of pictures. I think I sent 'em through Bob to send to the website for – there was nothing on there for Jeeps. It was all motorcycles and ATVs. And I don't remember the last time – I don't remember those pictures being updated.

CHAIR SAVINO: Exactly! And then what we've gotten back – in fact I got a letter back from Jay Ziemman on this stating he's gone; and I tried to contact PRfect Media and give 'em some suggestions.

MR. FRENCH: They contacted us. They gave us their business cards.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, they gave us their business cards to contact them.

MR. ENNIS: Who gave you their business cards?

CHAIR SAVINO: PRfect Media. And so we contacted them through a email – replying to their email from – some of the questions they had from 'em to us – and we – I got a email back – or a letter, certified letter back from Jay Ziemman stating that all of our communications with PRfect Media will go – shall go through Bob Baldwin. And then, two weeks later I get a confusing thing back from Bob Baldwin, because we were having a – an event, where we need him up there in the Show Low area for in June. Two weeks later I get a email back from Bob, it says, "Well, I've decided it's okay if you contact them directly." Yet I have this – so I have this letter in one hand saying – from Jay saying, "Don't contact them, go through Bob," yet Bob's sending me a email saying that you can contact them on this thing.

MR. ENNIS: [Inaudible.]

CHAIR SAVINO: I know. And you weren't. That's why I'm explaining it, so –

MR. FRENCH: I wish Mr. Merritt was here. I'd like to talk to him because back – I wasn't here, but in the December 1st meeting, he gave a presentation of all the stuff that he was gonna do for this website. And I have not seen any of it. I mean – I Googled –

MR. ENNIS: Who's Mr. Merritt?

MR. FRENCH: Mr. Merritt. He's the –

CHAIR SAVINO: He's from PRfect Media. He's the owner.

MR. FRENCH: Yeah, he's the one that come and give the – he's the COO of PRfect Media. Anyway, he made all sorts of promises. In promise he wanted to create domain names where –

[End of tape.]

MR. FRENCH: . . . off road, and it would steer me to this website. I did that and it's like gone to the third page or something. I mean it's not – and – I mean it's just – I can read some of this stuff that he promised that's just – uh

CHAIR SAVINO: Do we – you wanna get into that?

MR. FRENCH: No, we don't need to get into that right now.

CHAIR SAVINO: Basically, what we're saying, the answer to the question is the reason why we put down zero priority is that we aren't – we don't feel that we're getting the bang for our buck right now.

MR. FRENCH: A lot of issues.

[Pause.]

MS. PULSIFER: Okay, we'll have to determine if we –

[Side-bar discussions off record.]

MS. PULSIFER: It looks like it's real clear priorities – the project's gonna be priority. And the amount that's gonna go to the projects, as they have been in the past [unintelligible], and that's fine. The next thing that's real obvious is that the website is not a priority to you anymore; and I just need to clarify that the amount here – the recommendation is zero. Is that correct? Is that what everybody is recommending?

CHAIR SAVINO: And you know it's – how do we handle that folks? The – I feel I'm – hopefully I'm speaking for everyone. It is a priority of ours having that website. The issue is how it's run.

MR. FRENCH: I don't see the problem with it coming up in December, the end of the year when it runs out; and maybe they've made improvements. Maybe they – I don't see why we can't fund it and –

MS. ANTLE: Well can't we put it in the budget to say – what did we figure? Thirty thousand dollars to be funded – to be looked at, we don't necessarily have to fund it; but to look at that again in December and see what happens between now and December? Just allocate that money and if we don't use it, we'll put it into projects?

CHAIR SAVINO: I would love to, but I'm afraid that what would happen is it'd just get – automatically get over – rolled over into, you know, accepting them again.

MR. PFEIFER: Right now the website, you know – we really haven't seen much from that group. Okay, so, if we put a zero into that; and between now and December they make monumental changes, okay; we don't want to be locked into a zero.

MS. ANTLE: Right. That's what I just said.

CHAIR SAVINO: And that's where we're at our dilemma. And, one of the things is – that's why we tried to express to them at the last meetings, "here's the direction we were hoping that it would go," but it can't go there if it's not being forwarded to them.

MR. PFEIFER: If we put a monetary figure in there are we locked into that as well as a zero?

MR. FRENCH: I think so.

MS. PULSIFER: Okay, the contract's for \$50,000 up through December with [inaudible]. We have a contract with them through December. We have the money available. You'll need to pay them in May. They come in and they give you your updates and what they're doing; give you the opportunity to tell them, you know, what you like, what you don't like. At the end of December if you decide they didn't do what – they didn't produce at the end of their contract – final product – you don't wanna continue with [inaudible], then it's up to you if you want to get somebody else; do you want to go ahead and continue the rest of the next fiscal year with them – but you should leave – my suggestion is that you leave some money in there to give you the opportunity to figure out what you wanna do.

MR. FRENCH: Well, like Bob keeps telling us, we've got plenty of money in there.

MS. ANTLE: Yeah, but you need – you need to budget that money just so it's in that location.

MR. FRENCH: Why do we have to budget for two things, the Ambassador Program and the – two things we have to budget for.

MS. PULSIFER: So that we can – we have an accounting system. We have to assign –

MR. FRENCH: What happened to your accounting system when we go to the C-R-C –

CHAIR SAVINO: CREC – and then all of a – you know, you gotta understand where we're coming from. You mentioned one – on one hand you're saying, "Well, we don't – we can throw CREC's management issue for \$75,000. We can throw that into your general project budget; and you don't have to account for it. You don't see it anywhere on there. But yet you're saying that this has to be. We're saying, well why do we have to be tied down to that? Why can't we throw that into the projects –

MS. ANTLE: You have to have a budget to work with. I have to do this with the ASA every year. We may not spend that money on this particular pot; but it's budgeted for that.

CHAIR SAVINO: I asked Bob and he – I asked Bob –

MR. FRENCH: What happened to the CREC position? It's not budgeted anymore.

CHAIR SAVINO: Stop it! Let's put it back on the – wait a minute! Okay, guys, let's go through –

MR. FRENCH: When it's convenient –

CHAIR SAVINO: Stop! One at a time! Okay, one at a time. Okay, we can't all be talking, please! Pete?

MR. PFEIFER: My question is, say we put \$50,000 in there. We budget for it. In December, if we realize PRfect Media isn't the perfect marriage, and we cancel that contract, you know, there's nothing that rolls that \$50,000 into a new contract with them, right? Okay, yeah, so we can basically parcel out a piece of money, if they don't, you know, live up to their billing; then we can pull that money or leave it in the budget and just not touch it. Okay.

MS. ANTLE: It's just a placeholder.

MS. PULSIFER: Exactly!

CHAIR SAVINO: Let's recognize – guys, you have something to say?

MS. ANTLE: Me? Yeah, it's just a placeholder.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, Don, did you? No, go 'head.

MR. FRENCH: No! It's falling on deaf ears, so I –

CHAIR SAVINO: No, it isn't.

MR. FRENCH: You don't know how I feel. I don't see why we budget for some things and not others. And like I said, you especially made a precedent this time on saying we're not gonna budget for the CREC, which is \$75,000; and yet you insist on budgeting for \$50,000 for a thing that we say we don't want at this time. So, why not wait 'til we get to December and when it comes up, the money's there. We're not short money. Why not at that time vote on it? Bob said several times, "You've got the money." The money's there. Why are we – what's the deal? I just don't under –

CHAIR SAVINO: Doris?

MS. PULSIFER: In trying to explain that, CREC comes in with an application [inaudible]. They come in, they're awarded – you know, you would have the opportunity to award whatever it is, \$75,000 or whatever. They would come in with their application and it would be awarded. It would go into the project, but in our accounting system each project also gets the account number, if you wanna call it. So there's an accounting for what CREC uses or doesn't use. So there is an accounting.

CHAIR SAVINO: Doris, but following along those lines and following what Rebecca said a little while ago – and I asked Bob during your – while you were putting this up there, I asked him – why are we – because it’s something that’s always puzzled me – why are we even budgeting – putting down items. that budgets out there? What you said Rebecca is true in a business. I had businesses also. I had X amount of dollars that I had to work with, okay; and I had to budget that out. Anything else would go away. Okay? This here – we have this unlimited amount sitting there – it’s not unlimited, but it’s \$2 million stuff. We have that – what Don’s saying is that, why are we having to be tied down to something like this? It’s projects money. We’re talking about labor and stuff like that. That’s one thing I can see for Chris Gammage and what have you, because they gotta figure out if we didn’t put in that budget for him, then that position would go away.

The other money that’s sitting there, the grants money, why are we – what have we been doing with it? It’s part of that 200 and – \$2 million. The Chair recognizes Bob.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and group, the way the budget works is that the items. that are specified for dollar amounts are then approved by the Board. And that allows us to spend that money on that item. The money that’s left over and goes to projects is competitive, aid money. It can only be awarded in a competitive process. So if you didn’t give anything to PRfect Media – didn’t put anything into the budget for them right now, there would be no way to give them money in December, because you can’t just take money out of aid and say let’s give it to this project. It is competitive, grant money.

CHAIR SAVINO: True. And with that in mind then what would happen is that we would advertise that we’re interested in a media group coming in; and – for this amount and extend it. Now – and PRfect Media would have the chance – and just like any other grant that’s in front of us – that they would come up in front of us and we’d look at it and review it and approve it. You have – when you talk about that number that’s attached to that thing for your budget, we can’t foresee if Tonto National Forest comes in with a grant – at that time when we approve that budget and pass it on to State Parks, or what have you, then it’s awarded a number.

MS. PULSIFER: You’re confusing grants with contracts. The website is a contract. It’s not a competitive grant.

MR. ENNIS: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

MR. ENNIS: I think just having it as a placeholder is the way to go. If you wanna get rid of these guys, renew it, whatever – that’s completely up to you. And if you wanna get rid of your website, that money will not be used. But if you do, it’s budgeted.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, that makes sense. So with that in mind, does anybody wanna change? Rebecca.

MS. ANTLE: I'd like to make a motion that we do the budget according to what the plans are up there. What we've all agreed on – even though some of us don't agree on the website – that you have to have a budget because that way that money has a location to go to – even though it may not go there, you still have it there for that reason.

CHAIR SAVINO: That's fine. So we're back to the thing on – does anybody at this time wanna change their priority or their amount on PRfect Media?

MS. ANTLE: Well, I didn't put one up so I guess I could put some money up there.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, put the money up there then we have that on there.

MS. ANTLE: Okay, I'll put that up there.

CHAIR SAVINO: Does anybody else wanna change their thing?

MR. PFEIFER: Yeah I'd like to put a placeholder for PRfect Media –

CHAIR SAVINO: For a media group. We're not saying for PRfect Media, we're saying for a media group.

MR. BALDWIN: Again, Mr. Chair and group, if you're saying that you don't wanna continue with PRfect Media but you want to hire somebody else, then you're looking at starting over with a one-year contract for \$50,000, not \$30,000. To add \$22,000 to continue –

MR. PFEIFER: So the placeholder needs to be \$50,000?

MR. BALDWIN: Well, I mean, if you wanna scrap them altogether and go with somebody else, then, yes. You need to put in enough to handle a one-year contract.

MR. PFEIFER: Okay.

MS. ANTLE: Yes, change it to \$50,000 – both of 'em. That gives us the ability if we want to go with someone else.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right. Okay.

MS. PULSIFER: Then we've got – number two, we've got two for the Ambassador Program and two priority [unintelligible] for –

CHAIR SAVINO: For travel?

MS. PULSIFER: For travel a four, but we also have trails, [unintelligible] –

MS. ANTLE: That was me. I wanna allocate that kind of money just for signage; because we've just gone through travel management and we're gonna have these agencies need to put maps out, they need to put signs out; so, I would like to put a small amount of money – like a small grants program, but something that they can pull money from.

CHAIR SAVINO: I asked Bob that a few minutes ago and he said that that's where that \$50,000 would take in –

MS. ANTLE: Okay, then put that underneath that.

CHAIR SAVINO: I talked about these stickers and he said that's where that comes in.

MR. PFEIFER: Beautiful. Okay.

MS. PULSIFER: Now we've got – it looks like we've got the trailers – and I'm assuming you mean –

MS. ANTLE: Then the next one down would be also for that – that one. That's the trailers.

CHAIR SAVINO: And my priority is the – that's not \$50.

MS. PULSIFER: So we still need to determine, do we want to have money for the Ambassador Program for the BLM because we've got two people here that feel that this is important to continue. So do we want to still budget for the Ambassador Program, or do we want to have an addition to the FTE, or do we want to replace it with the FTE?

CHAIR SAVINO: I'd like to ask a question here. Can we – if we budgeted over there for the Ambassador Program for that employee, can we still be working on doing it and having that person moved over here?

MR. ENNIS: When you say, "moved over here," you're not talking – Mr. Chairman, you're not talking about moving a federal employee over here are you?

CHAIR SAVINO: No, I'm – that position's not – that – yeah, that label.

MR. ENNIS: My understanding of your money is that you have enough – you have flexibility. I guess it's a question that I can't answer. So about the effectiveness of – you know – do you have too many if you have three or whatnot; but in terms of the ability to take – subject to contractual agreements that you have with the feds – to move those folks over to hire one or one-and-a-half or whatnot, yeah sure, you can do that? Does that answer – does that answer your question?

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, my question was, if I – I don't want to see the program just go away.

MR. ENNIS: No!

CHAIR SAVINO: So I'm just saying – I'm not saying if we couldn't do – move that – something over to State Parks, then I wanna keep it there.

MS. PULSIFER: So do we want it as a placeholder, then? You wanna keep it as a placeholder?

CHAIR SAVINO: Does that make sense to you?

MS. ANTLE: Yeah, I would keep it as a placeholder, I think.

MS. PULSIFER: And then if we – you know – were able to move [inaudible], then –

CHAIR SAVINO: Then that would go –

MS. PULSIFER: I mean it's still there –

CHAIR SAVINO: The money's still the same money.

MR. ENNIS: It's either going to them or us. But we've budgeted for that amount.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman, that agreement with BLM expires the end of September, their fiscal year. So we would have three months between July and September to figure out if it can be moved in house before we would have to renew that agreement.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MR. FRENCH: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes, Don.

MR. FRENCH: Wouldn't it make more sense to just approve the FTE and then debate later whether – I mean, is that through our channels that it gets moved over? Is that – can we – I don't know if we have – OHVAG has the authority to say – I mean, we need the FTE wherever they're at for the Ambassador Program. So –

CHAIR SAVINO: The only problem there, Don, is that – you didn't finish. Go 'head.

MR. FRENCH: No, I'm –

CHAIR SAVINO: The only problem there that I see is that we don't want to leave Chris Gammage or that person in limbo. We have to approve it one way or the other. Is that what you're saying?

MR. FRENCH: Well I'm – I don't know that we have authority to say move them from BLM to State Parks. I mean, I don't know if we wanna do that –

CHAIR SAVINO: No, we don't. And that's what Kent was just mentioning. We're not talking about the federal employee – moving 'em over – we're talking about getting a position, establishing a position with State Parks and then take those roles and bring them over here to State Parks. But then, what we do is – if that happens then the federal employees would be – yeah, they'd drop off and it'd be – they need to know, BLM needs to know if they're gonna have to pick up their expenses over there. Right?

MR. FRENCH: It's not as easy as saying, "Chris you now work for State Parks?"

CHORUS OF VOICES: Oh no.

MR. FRENCH: Okay.

SPEAKER: I wish it were that easy.

MR. FRENCH: Yeah, that's what I'm saying. We may be arguing over a moot point. Just approve the position and then argue over the rest of it later?

MS. PULSIFER: Yeah.

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, the biggest thing is – yeah. If we did get that position and we'd work towards that and we appropriated money for that position with State Parks, then the other should go away. You follow me there?

MR. ENNIS: One or two should go away. Is that what you're saying?

CHAIR SAVINO: One would go away because – yeah.

MS. ANTLE: So then you're just saying that the Ambassador Program would be – all be a volunteer system underneath the Ambassador – the Arizona State Parks Ambassador Coordinator.

SPEAKER: Would that be a project, Doris?

CHAIR SAVINO: No, I would say – I'm saying that \$65,000 that Chris Gammage would get from us for his job over there would come over here for an employee working for State Parks.

MS. ANTLE: Okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bob you have any input on this at all?

MR. BALDWIN: Well, Mr. Chairman and group, to create a position at State Parks we'd have to identify a position description, they'd have to put it out for hire – competitive hire and Chris would have to apply for it.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right.

MR. BALDWIN: So there would be no guarantee that he would wanna do that; but, you know, we could end up starting over with a new person altogether and having this thing in house; so, there's a lot of stuff going on there. Plus the fact that they have a storage facility for equipment; we have no storage facilities here for any equipment. You know, there're just a lot of things that make it work better having them in that position.

MR. ENNIS: Mr. Chairman, if I may follow on. When I said that it's possible moneywise to do this, it is. But is it – what's the proper bang or effectiveness of these employees? I can't judge on that.

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, I would like –

MR. ENNIS: Bob's alluding to that with one aspect of that.

CHAIR SAVINO: Kent, what I would like to see if – right now all we're talking about is budget and down the road; but then the issue may come up and we put it on the agenda, then we talk about the feasibility of it. It's just that we've opened the door – we've had it available to us that way. If we talk about it, put it on the agenda a couple meetings from now, and we don't have that budgeted item; we can't talk about that. Okay, go 'head, Doris.

MS. PULSIFER: Okay, so the next thing – we agree to go ahead and include in the budget [inaudible]. We want to include travel?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes that's our –

MS. PULSIFER: Is everybody agreeable to \$15,000 for travel?

CHAIR SAVINO: Well we have different amounts there, don't we?

MS. PULSIFER: Well, this one is – this is the travel. I only have one up here for travel.

CHAIR SAVINO: Only two people put in for travel?

MS. PULSIFER: We've got one for \$15,000 and one for \$10,000. How much do you want to recommend for travel?

CHAIR SAVINO: Ten?

MR. PFEIFER: Nice round figure.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah? Okay, we'll go with the ten.

MS. PULSIFER: Okay, this \$75,000 part –

MR. PFEIFER: For the Ambassador Program to expand, you're gonna need a second Chris Gammage or somebody to run that. 'Cause you're gonna work the good bull to death with Chris Gammage trying to run the whole state.

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, that's where we covered it by putting that \$155,000 down.

MR. PFEIFER: Okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: That covers both positions.

MS. PULSIFER: Yeah. I think it would be included.

CHAIR SAVINO: So that all covers in that same thing. And what we do with it later is –

MR. PFEIFER: Okay.

MS. PULSIFER: And we wanna request the FTP for cost. Then the website, we're good with the \$50,000.

MR. PFEIFER: The \$50,000 placeholder.

CHAIR SAVINO: Kinda hit what you just said? You questioned Kent on this. You were alluding to – would this be out of our operating expenses for that FTE? Well I – I would like – I'm only speaking for myself now on this – is that – to enhance that – if that position – because realistically is \$75,000 -- \$65,000 enough when you talk about expense – you know, insurance and all that involved in it. We'd be willing to get it back over here to State Parks. We'd be willing to supplement that position. Let's say you have X amount of dollars here and that's why –

MS. PULSIFER: And that's – I mean, the reason I'm asking is because, as you mentioned Bob is wearing four hats.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

MS. PULSIFER: And this would be an in-house person to help Bob run the *whole* program. This is more just, you know, the Ambassador part. So that's why I was suggesting that. You know maybe what we need to do is to continue this and then [inaudible]. He still could help Bob in house with his reports.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MS. PULSIFER: [Inaudible.]

CHAIR SAVINO: I'm just saying let's consider it to sweeten the pot, if we have to.

MR. ENNIS: That's just a fact of life that our ERE at the State – what we call "employee-related expense," the insurance and all that stuff – is darn expensive, just like it is for everybody else.

MS. PULSIFER: And I estimated, if you were planning to, a medium salary. I included the ERE, so, roughly \$62,000/\$63,000 could cover a FTE for [inaudible].

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MS. PULSIFER: So, are we all good on these recommendations? I'll go 'round one more time just to be clear. We've got the Ambassador Program, \$155,200; the in-house OHV project money for \$50,000. We've got travel, \$10,000; we've got – this is gonna be out of admin – the admin portion. You don't have to worry about that – and the website, \$50,000. So we're all good, clear? Agreed?

[No verbal response.]

MS. PULSIFER: Okay. And then anything that's left goes to projects.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Do we need to make a motion on this; or is this –

MS. PULSIFER: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: We do? Ha, good luck with this motion. Will you please help us out with this, Doris?

[Laughter.]

MS. PULSIFER: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: What she says. Pretend it's me talking.

MS. ANTLE: I think I can do that.

MS. PULSIFER: Okay.

MS. ANTLE: Hold on, let me see if I got this right. All right. The OHVAG group would like to make a motion to budget the following amounts. That a good start? Okay. We would like to allocate \$155,200 for the BLM Ambassador Program, \$50,000 to the in-house Trail Maintenance Program – OHV program –

in-house OHV program; \$10,000 for travel expenses for projects – I think that's how we wanna do this.

MR. PFEIFER: For Sticker Fund – promoting the Sticker Fund.

MS. ANTLE: Okay, Sticker -- \$10,000 for travel expenses for promoting the Sticker Fund. All of the final – all of the left-over money after these allocations will go for –

MS. PULSIFER: You left out the website.

MS. ANTLE: Oh, I'm sorry. I got it right there on the top, too. And then \$50,000 for the website to be decided in December – for the website for \$50,000 and then the final money will go for projects.

MR. PFEIFER: I'll second that motion.

CHAIR SAVINO: It's been moved by Rebecca and seconded by Pete, all those in favor say aye.

CHORUS OF VOICES: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, there's four ayes, no nays. Okay, the budget's taken care of, gosh!

G. REPORTS

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay now we're getting into reports. OHV Program Partner Reports. "Representative from Bureau of Land Management." Nobody's here from Fish and Game – none scheduled. Let's move on to Staff Reports. Bob? As soon as we get done with this, we're done; and then we'll break for lunch.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair, I'm gonna begin on page 21 in your packet. These are the reports that I've given you every month – or every meeting I should say. This is up through – deposits through April of this year. So, in the – on 21 you see the fuel tax revenues currently at – State Parks' portion, \$1.26 million. Under that is the decal sticker portion: to date, \$973,000; and then interest of \$17,000, for a total year-to-date revenue into the fund for State Parks of \$2.25 million. So that is – and the projected – of course there's two more months remaining on here; so we do anticipate – if you just look at the monthly revenues in there, \$115,000 for stickers, another \$124,000 for gas tax revenues, so that's about \$250,000 over the next two months; another \$500,000 -- \$2.7 million estimated total for the year. Okay?

Now, as of last year, we – the only thing that comes out of that is the \$692,000 that's appropriated by legislature, and then 12 percent, which amounts to another \$300,000 which is the admin – the program administration portion. Last year we had some minor sweeps out of that. Next year we will have no sweeps. So, if you anticipate the same amount of revenue next year, you're looking at another \$2.7 million, minus \$1 million, basically; which would leave you about a \$1.7 million for projects. That is in addition to the \$2.0 million that's sitting there

right now -- \$2.5 million -- \$2.3 -- whatever it says here. Any questions on that page?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Go 'head.

MR. BALDWIN: The main figure -- well if you go through here you'll see that there are no anticipated sweeps for next year. So the bottom right-hand corner -- \$2.065 million -- again, that is the current, available amount for projects or for allocated expenditures from last year's budget. And we do anticipate another \$500,000 to the end of the year.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I have a question on that page, on page 22.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: This alludes back to the question I had last month on this. Under OHV Program Administration, you have "travel in state, \$6,500." You gave us -- I had the same question last month and it was -- you inquired with Mr. Myron Snider about these expenses and that's -- can you allude to that, please?

MR. BALDWIN: I thought they were going to correct that. It should have been corrected on here. That's what the memo -- in your packet for the minutes for the April 6 meeting on page four was the response from her: Phoenix Office Motor Pool charges partially, agency et cetera, the admin motor pool budget is \$6,500; that's what's been paid; and -- there is some indication that was billed to the wrong code or something in that; and it was supposed to be corrected. So, I --

CHAIR SAVINO: But what I gather from that, Bob, is that he's just alluding to the small amount. I still didn't get my answer on the \$6,500.

MR. BALDWIN: That is the amount --

CHAIR SAVINO: Are you saying that whole amount was billed incorrectly?

MR. BALDWIN: It appears that's what she's saying, "The resource section budget is also \$6,500, but is from Slip-PCA and it appears that they got put on here instead of the other funding source."

MR. ENNIS: That will be reversed out, immediately.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, so that isn't -- that was my big issue I had.

MR. ENNIS: [Inaudible].

CHAIR SAVINO: He did handle it last month when we asked him and they didn't --

MR. ENNIS: The person he's talking about is rounding the numbers, so --

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MS. PULSIFER: And keep in mind that this report is through April; so she may have corrected it in May.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, thank you.

MR. BALDWIN: So, page 20 – any other questions on 22?

[No verbal response.]

MR. BALDWIN: All right, page 23 is a report – I don't think I've given you this one, but Chairman Savino has requested the full status of projects. This just shows you all the projects that are open and the money that's been expended on it. So it doesn't really say how close they are to completed, or what they've done or haven't done; but it does show you which ones have been closed – completed and closed, paid out – paid off. So, that is everything that's been approved by you guys since we really started this Sticker Fund Program and there were a few – these are all OHV, so this wouldn't include any RTP-funded projects at all.

CHAIR SAVINO: So we have approximately 32 open – let me back outta there. We have – that's minus the Ambassador Program, the \$15,000 open projects – but we still have those; so we have 32 open projects right now.

MR. BALDWIN: If you look over on the right side, a lot of these are closed.

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, no. I'm counting just the open ones.

MR. BALDWIN: Well –

CHAIR SAVINO: I just went through and counted the open ones.

MR. BALDWIN: That's the status whatever they are, open or closed.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, so – are you – what are you doing as far as getting out and inspecting any of these projects? Do you have the time, wearing four hats, to get out and do an inspection to see where they are; or you just relying on their reporting back to you?

MR. BALDWIN: They make quarterly reports on the progress and submit requests for reimbursement as the funds are expended. So, that's the extent of the information I have about where the projects stand.

CHAIR SAVINO: And that's understandable wearing four hats.

MR. BALDWIN: Typically I try to get out and visit completed projects, I don't go out while they're working.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Pete?

MR. PFEIFER: You get quarterly – basically status reports from these guys and whatnot? Is it possible for us to get that information as well?

MR. BALDWIN: Uhm –

MR. PFEIFER: Just 'cause I've called and talked to some of these guys, Bob, and they – they kinda give me what's going on and, you know, where the status is at, stuff like that. It's information that's interesting to find out.

MS. PULSIFER: Can I just say something? You know, with 32 projects open, we would be giving you a lot of information. If you have a question on a specific project, you know, you could always, you know, ask about a specific project; but

I don't – just keep in mind that it'd be a lot of work, a lot of compiling to get everything for all 32 open projects. My suggestion is that if you have a question about a specific project to – you can always call Bob.

MR. PFEIFER: Okay.

MS. PULSIFER: That all right with you? I'm volunteering him here.

CHAIR SAVINO: I just want it to be noted that in past times when you did have a full staff we were getting our fair share in getting the people going – Amy was going out to these projects and coming back with reports on that, so – we are still getting – in fact we're giving more money to State Parks now, our OHV Funds going into the Recreation Fund; and we have all our chips in the one man wearing four hats. He doesn't have the time to get out there, so, that should be noted. Okay, anything – any other questions? Don.

MR. FRENCH: I have a couple questions on page 24, the projects. I see that Game and Fish Department have finished their safety video for \$136,680.

MR. BALDWIN: No, that's not a completed project. They were advanced that money so – but it hasn't – the project isn't completed.

MR. FRENCH: It says, "closed."

MR. BALDWIN: Well, that's not correct. They're not finished.

MR. FRENCH: Okay, so it's not closed?

MR. BALDWIN: We haven't brought you anything on that and –

MR. FRENCH: Yeah, that's what I was wondering. I'd like to see the finished project or something. So it's still open? And they haven't used the \$136,680?

MR. BALDWIN: Well, I couldn't say to a – on a project like that they would provide a final billing and identify the expenses up to that amount at that time. So, they don't send me updates as they spend the money.

MR. FRENCH: Do they have any indication on when it's gonna be done or a completion date?

MR. BALDWIN: I have to look back at what their proposal was and see exactly what they proposed as completion dates. It seems. like that's been – it seems. like that's been a year, hasn't it? It was in August of last year that we saw that, so – it was May last year up in –

CHAIR SAVINO: I think it was in May.

MR. BALDWIN: . . . Bedrock, right.

CHAIR SAVINO: Go 'head, Don.

MR. FRENCH: The other one, the Fish and – Game and Fish, of course – the same one. It shows that they bought the UTVs, but they've only spent part of the money. Is that – do you know what the deal on that is? Is that – they buying them in pieces?

MR. BALDWIN: Right, those – those – these projects were funded 80 percent advanced to the project. Again, final accounting of the expenditures is at the end of the project. It doesn't mean that they've spent that money yet or they may have spent it all.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bob, do you know what's happened with that?

MR. FRENCH: Yeah, they're either bought or not bought. I just wondered.

MR. BALDWIN: Well, I couldn't tell you whether they're bought or not bought right now.

CHAIR SAVINO: One of the stipulations I remember asking Jimmy when – Jimmy Simmons from Game and Fish – when we awarded this money is that we'd have an update on – you know, periodic update on what's happening with that. Because, you know, if you remember they wanted 12 of 'em, I believe – 10 or 12.

MR. FRENCH: Yeah.

CHAIR SAVINO: Then we said we'd only give 'em five – four or five – but with the stipulation we wanted to see how it's used and a record of it; and we haven't heard anything back. So we can basically assume they haven't bought anything with 'em. They've just been funded the 80 percent of the money up front. Am I correct there?

MR. BALDWIN: They do get advanced 80 percent of the project money on those.

CHAIR SAVINO: So they haven't gotten back to you yet on a quarterly – they should be four quarters – get four reports given you since it was done last year at this time.

MR. BALDWIN: I don't ask for quarterly reports on one-year projects like that. Again, they have the money; they do the project, they tell me when it's done. So, as far as having a Game and Fish report we can certainly include them in the next agenda. We have a section there for updates from agency partners. Jimmy was here today, but couldn't stay for the whole thing; so, you know, we need to put those on the agenda and then handle them in a timely fashion so that they don't have to sit through the whole meeting before they get to make their presentations.

CHAIR SAVINO: Thank you very much. Don do you have any other questions?

MR. FRENCH: Nope, thanks.

CHAIR SAVINO: Do you have any, Pete?

MR. PFEIFER: No, thanks Bob.

CHAIR SAVINO: So thank you on that. Do you have any other items. on that?

MR. BALDWIN: That's it.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, then I – at this point what I'd like to do is to adjourn for lunch. What time do you expect –

MR. BALDWIN: One o'clock.

CHAIR SAVINO: One o'clock; okay, we have a half hour for lunch and we'll be back and take care of – do we have a – I was just a little bit confused down there. Are we going into executive session at that time?

MR. BALDWIN: Yes sir.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, so at one o'clock we'll come back and we're gonna go into executive session with the Attorney General – Assistant Attorney General's Office. Thank you.

[Break for lunch.]

CHAIR SAVINO: I'd like to call back into order the Off – Arizona State Parks Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group on this June date of Friday, June 1st at 1:10 p.m., and we are going into executive session. OHVAG will meet in executive session to discuss or consult with its attorney for legal advice regarding the grant process.

MS. HERNBRODE: Mr. Chairman, you do need a vote to go into executive session.

CHAIR SAVINO: I do?

MS. HERNBRODE: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Do we have to have a motion or just a vote.

MS. HERNBRODE: Well you have to have a motion – somebody –

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. I'd like to entertain a motion to go into executive session.

MR. PFEIFER: I'd like to make a motion – this is Pete Pfeifer – I'd like to make a motion we go into executive session.

MR. FRENCH: Second.

CHAIR SAVINO: Seconded by Don French. All those in favor say aye.

CHORUS OF VOICES: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: Opposed, no.

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: So, we are now in executive session.

[Adjourned to executive session.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I'd like to call back into session Arizona State Parks Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group on this June 1st – it hasn't changed yet it's still – June 1, 2012. It's 2:15 p.m. First off I'd like to start off by entertaining a motion that we take – before I forget about this motion – I'd like to entertain a motion that we postpone the next grant cycle until our – yes ma'am.

MS. HERNBRODE: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that you need to do that, because the next grant cycle can't happen until you have a grant manual.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MS. HERNBRODE: And you'll have to approve the grant manual; so, you're already out.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, can I – then should I entertain a motion to – to not have Bob send out the current grants manual?

MS. HERNBRODE: We already know you're gonna change it.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, you don't have to make it official. Okay.

MS. HERNBRODE: You're good!

MR. BALDWIN: That's the next item on the agenda to discuss criteria for the next grant manual.

MS. HERNBRODE: After this.

MR. BALDWIN: After we do this. Then you'll see how this works and you can determine what you wanna change for the next time. So – and the reason that we're basically –

CHAIR SAVINO: The next – excuse me, but the next thing on our agenda item is to rate these 11 grants.

MS. HERNBRODE: He meant after that.

CHAIR SAVINO: After that – okay. All right, then, let's go forward with it.

MR. BALDWIN: All right.

CHAIR SAVINO: I just wanna state that I do wanna – don't want to have that grants manual sent out for the next cycle until we have time to do it; and I also want to let you know that on the next agenda the only thing that we want to have on our next meeting agenda is this grants rating form, period.

MS. HERNBRODE: Well you'll need the –

CHAIR SAVINO: I'd like to have a workshop on this, an open workshop, to discuss this new rating form. Okay?

MS. HERNBRODE: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest you also discuss your manual at that time so that you'll be ready to go forward.

CHAIR SAVINO: The grants manual at the same time – that's all inclusive. Okay, with that said, I want to go on, "The OHVAG will review the grant-rating process" – no?

MS. HERNBRODE: Nope. One up.

CHAIR SAVINO: I wanna –

MS. HERNBRODE: F(1).

CHAIR SAVINO: F(1): OHVAG will discuss the statewide OHV Program funding – project funding applications and select projects for funding. Staff will provide an

overview of the grant application process and general rules for grant projects and guide the group through the grant-rating process until they agree on the total priority points to be awarded for each project. Projects will be selected for funding based on the score and the availability of funds. I'm gonna turn the floor over to Bob Baldwin.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and group – first of all, I hope everybody brought their grant packets with the – with the information; their evaluation score, their cost sheets and any project description information, because basically as Joy said – and what we've tried to impress on you when we were developing this process and when we first announced the grant manual – or when you approved the grant manual back in January – is that the applicant is asked to describe their project, break it down into components that identify the costs and those components will also help us identify which of the criteria that they are meeting; and with that information we can fill in all the numbers on the first page. Okay?

Once we've done that, the bonus part is fairly simple. Once you have numbers in each of these categories, you've identified where they got their score; we zip through the bonus part and they get what they get. All right? And you'll see that as we go through these, they will get easier and easier.

I'd like to start with the project that you indicated the most favorite with you guys the last time you scored. That would be the first one on the list, the Cave Creek Ranger District. The project is, "Desert Vista Trail System Phase I." All right. So if you'd pull out the grant application form, the cost sheets, their criteria responses we'll get started on that one.

CHAIR SAVINO: Where do – Bob? If I may. We've already rated these projects. At our last meeting we went through there, we took the summary – that's where you came up with the eights. We went – your board didn't work at the time. We had David Moore taking down the numbers of each person that was at the meeting. We've already rated. We can't come back – so it's all redundant at this point. We have to stick with those numbers that we voted on last time. Otherwise we're changing it and the people that were here, the representatives from each – from the Tonto, for instance, they were here representing it. Now they're not here, we can't change those numbers we came up with.

MS. HERNBRODE: Mr. Chairman, you didn't come to a consensus on those numbers.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes we did. What'd you mean we didn't?

MR. FRENCH: We sure did. We sent them in to –

CHAIR SAVINO: We sent it in to her and she came up with those. All she had to do was average those out. So why are we re-inventing the wheel?

MS. HERNBRODE: An average is not a consensus. A consensus is everybody agrees on it.

CHAIR SAVINO: All I'm saying is that – and I agree there. Okay, a consensus. But you had my – what my feelings are on that. I can't change what I told you last

time at that meeting. I have to stick with that. Because if I do it any different, I feel that I'm breaking the law by being influenced out of the realm of that meeting.

MS. HERNBRODE: No, what you did last time is each member indicated what their individual thoughts were on each one of these – for each one of these categories. Now you need to go through and say, “Okay, well, we had these numbers. Which one – what number are we choosing? Does Desert Vista get an eight – does everybody agree Desert Vista gets an eight in A? Does everybody agree that Desert Vista gets a – you know – whatever?”

CHAIR SAVINO: No! And you can't even do that and it's not – another thing you can't do. Pete Pfeifer wasn't even at the meeting. He didn't have – those people – if I were a Tonto representative and I was able to stand up there and give my presentation and answer questions; now I'm having this person over here that wasn't at that meeting rate it, that's not fair.

MS. HERNBRODE: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is a properly noticed meeting. They could have showed up here as well. And –

MR. FRENCH: You're making rules.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah.

MR. FRENCH: This is totally –

MS. HERNBRODE: I'm telling –

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman, you tabled this issue, which means that it wasn't completed.

CHAIR SAVINO: The portion that was completed that was on these numbers – going across there – Pete?

MR. BALDWIN: You tabled the whole issue. And Pete has a – Pete has a – he's still got as much right to participate in this as anyone else.

CHAIR SAVINO: Go 'head, Pete.

MR. BALDWIN: So –

MR. PFEIFER: I don't think they're asking you to change any of your numbers. All they wanted us to do is just look at the numbers and say, “Does everybody agree that this should be an eight or nine?”

CHAIR SAVINO: We had –

MR. FRENCH: They can't. The guys that were here last week that heard the argument –

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, David Moore was here for the presentation. What about his numbers?

MR. PFEIFER: Okay, I gotcha!

MS. HERNBRODE: What choice do you have? You have a quorum now.

CHAIR SAVINO: All I'm saying – our choices that we go by – what the numbers were that were written down by the people that were here at – the four people that were in the quorum, last meeting. Why do we need to go over the whole thing again?

MR. PFEIFER: Okay.

MS. HERNBRODE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. FRENCH: Now if you wanna go and add numbers –

CHAIR SAVINO: If his numbers there –

MR. PFEIFER: Well then we'd still have to review them and say – you know – you and I and David – I'll put eight for number one. Is everybody in agreement with that? And then go on to the next column.

MS. HERNBRODE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. PFEIFER: I missed the last meeting so I don't know what happened, but –

MS. HERNBRODE: Where those – where those numbers all agree – it should not be difficult to agree, for instance, that Desert Vista gets an eight in category B in the first-level priority. 'Cause everybody agreed. As long as Pete's still on board with that, you put an eight in there, we move on. It's where, for instance, in category A – you have three eights and a zero – you need to come to a decision –

CHAIR SAVINO: Wait! How did you come up with those numbers?

MS. HERNBRODE: Somebody wrote down what the scores were.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes, from last meeting.

MS. HERNBRODE: Right.

CHAIR SAVINO: So why do we need to do it again?

MS. HERNBRODE: Because you need to determine whether you're giving that an eight or a zero. It's not a cumulative number.

CHAIR SAVINO: I'm just saying that –

MS. HERNBRODE: It's not a majority rules.

CHAIR SAVINO: He needs to [unintelligible] what this – what A is.

MR. FRENCH: So now you're saying that we all have to agree on – we have to sit down and agree on these numbers?

MS. HERNBRODE: Correct!

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, you have to come up with one – yes or no.

MS. HERNBRODE: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: That's where the average came in before.

MR. BALDWIN: Also, the evaluation –

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, go on, Bob.

MR. BALDWIN: The evaluation during the last meeting was not based on the information they provided. You were critically looking at the cost items. and identifying what they actually accomplished, as it compared to these. Several of you – there were lots of votes for – be – giving points in Number A. If you look at the explanation for Number A on your sheets, it says, “Protect access and acquire building.” The actions, “Implement more comprehensive planning and projections into the future identified, unprotected areas for designated trails and routes and acquire land – existing and proposed trails. Permanently secure access to designated trails and routes. Consider increased trails access –

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, Bob. Okay, stop it! Go back with your presentation. Start as you were gonna do it. Okay? Let’s just get on with it.

MR. BALDWIN: All right, so, I assume you have – like I mentioned, the application form, the cost items. and/or justification of where the monies go. Again a grant writer is gonna try –

[End of tape.]

MS. HERNBRODE: . . . or you don’t have a quorum for the White Mountain Trails –

CHAIR SAVINO: I do not recuse myself.

MS. HERNBRODE: . . . and you can rate it at the next one.

CHAIR SAVINO: I’m stating to you right now I do not recuse myself.

MS. HERNBRODE: Despite the fact that you wrote this grant?

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, then if we don’t – if we don’t have a quorum we don’t have a quorum for any of ‘em. And it’s all down – down the tubes. You wanna do that?

MS. HERNBRODE: Well you aren’t recusing yourself on all of ‘em, sir.

CHAIR SAVINO: I’m not gonna play this game of going back and forth, Joy. This is gonna be –

MS. HERNBRODE: I apologize that you feel that way, John. I’m not trying to play a game with you. I’m trying to help you.

CHAIR SAVINO: You’re not helping me any. Please.

MS. HERNBRODE: Okay, you’re not –

CHAIR SAVINO: I dig myself a hole all the time.

MS. HERNBRODE: I understand that you’re not recusing yourself, we’re going forward with the White Mountain Open Trails Association with the four members that are here.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, ‘cause I don’t want to see this whole thing washed down the drain, and that’s what’s gonna happen.

MR. BALDWIN: All right then, pull out the application form, and there were no cost estimate sheets on this. So the project is a NEPA assessment for trails.

CHAIR SAVINO: And as you remember, the cost estimate sheet was waived by Bob because he said that the applicant didn't have the full understanding of the new application form; and since it was a new application grant coming forward that it was allowed to be in there.

MR. BALDWIN: Basically I said that because we are taking the information provided by all of the applicants – all of the – all of their forms. that tell us how many points they got in all these categories and we're reassessing those based on the – our understanding of the criteria.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right.

MR. BALDWIN: That we could use that process for your application.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MR. BALDWIN: Since you didn't provide the evaluation sheets, we're -- we are assessing it based on what you did give us.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay? And that would be the project description which is a – and there was one cost estimate, the contractor provided an estimate of cost; and that's from SWCA. So that's basically the cost estimate. And it includes a – environmental assessment, biological resources assessment, cultural resource assessment – conduct a field analysis to develop alternatives as necessary, conduct public scoping, draft and submit specialist reports, develop an environmental assessment, document for signature and other tests associated with a EA. All right?

CHAIR SAVINO: Bob, do you want to throw in that questionnaire that you sent out that Rebecca had some questions on pertaining to this grant? And you answered it – her question – but you also proceeded to answer nine other questions that weren't asked for you to do? Would you like to add that onto this?

MR. BALDWIN: That would come into the funding once we determine whether or not you want to fund the project. That was a memo that was added to the packet that you guys saw separately from – from this stuff. It says, "Memo to OHVAG." All right, so based on the quote from SWCA and the application form, does this project acquire any land or trails?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes – by doing it it would acquire land. If it's approved – the NEPA Study – it would acquire land for trails.

MR. BALDWIN: The Forest Service already owns the land.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. I understand there. Okay, so that – it wouldn't then. It wouldn't acquire land, it would change land possibly from non-use to use – motorized use.

MR. BALDWIN: That would be item D, designate.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. So you're saying in A it's zero.

MR. BALDWIN: I'm not saying that. You all agree?

CHAIR SAVINO: No, I mean, that's what we're –

MR. FRENCH: I've got a question. How would anybody ever do first level priority A, "Acquire land for public access?"

MR. BALDWIN: A Maricopa County project did that.

CHAIR SAVINO: No, they didn't.

MR. BALDWIN: They were processing a patent for RPT.

MR. FRENCH: I don't understand.

MS. HERNBRODE: They're purchasing property.

MR. FRENCH: Okay. We've had a grant to purchase?

MR. BALDWIN: We don't get 'em very often, but this is a good example of meeting that criteria.

MS. ANTLE: Normally that goes through like Game and Fish, we can do access of land by a partnership through that; but yeah you can do that.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, but how 'bout – you two're looking at just the second part of that, "Acquire land." How 'bout to protect access to trails?

MR. FRENCH: I've got my notes. I've got a ruling from Joy that says that's – with acquiring – the only way you can protect access to trails by acquiring land for public access. I got that. That's her interpretation of it, so –

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Sorry, Bob, go 'head.

MR. BALDWIN: All right, does it maintain or renovate any trails?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: How 'bout mitigate or restore damaged areas?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: All right. Establish, designate trails or routes?

MS. ANTLE: Yes, because it's got NEPA, right?

MR. BALDWIN: Correct. That's what NEPA does.

MS. ANTLE: Okay.

MR. BALDWIN: All right. Does it provide on-the-ground presence?

MS. ANTLE: Nope.

MR. BALDWIN: Law enforcement?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Provide and install trail route signage?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. FRENCH: I'd have to argue maybe with the second priority A, on-the-ground management presence. If they have a race there, aren't they gonna be there? Most races I've ever been to have been monitored and quite –

MR. BALDWIN: But the races are part of the application. All the application asks for is money for NEPA.

MR. FRENCH: I thought it was for a race corridor.

CHAIR SAVINO: No, it's race – not a race corridor, but just a trails corridor.

MR. FRENCH: Okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: It's not just racing.

MR. BALDWIN: All right so item – second level, item C, "Provide maps, trail route information."

CHAIR SAVINO: What did we say on B a zero?

MR. BALDWIN: [Unintelligible.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, and then C is provide trail maps? No?

MR. BALDWIN: C is maps; but does it do that?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: D provide education programs?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Develop support facilities?

CHAIR SAVINO: As a result of down the road, but no. That's in a different grant.

MR. BALDWIN: Promote coordinated volunteerism?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: How does it do that?

CHAIR SAVINO: Well the matching funds is coming from the White Mountain Open Trails Association where you have people out there working on the ground with this SWCA to do the environmental study so we're promoting volunteerism.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay now it does show a \$2,500 match, but it doesn't exactly say what's being done to – I mean, this is what you're telling me now?

CHAIR SAVINO: I just told you – yeah, that's what I'm telling you, that that's what it's for. That match was used for that.

MR. BALDWIN: All right; but is that promoting volunteerism? Is that –

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, I'll give you an example. My time, I was asked by the Forest Service to do this grant for them. I volunteered; and I spent six hours doing the grant application. Didn't I volunteer to do that? So isn't this in a sense promoting volunteerism? This grant isn't for the White Mountain Open Trails Association. It has nothing to do with our club except we're doing a favor for the Forest Service. So we're promoting volunteerism by helping them out.

MR. BALDWIN: The rest of you see it that way? It's your decision.

MR. PFEIFER: I would say yeah.

CHAIR SAVINO: What's the consensus?

MS. ANTLE: I don't know. That one's hard to say.

MR. FRENCH: I'll give you that one.

CHAIR SAVINO: No, don't give me anything. I could care – you know – I care, but – I just wanna get through.

MR. PFEIFER: So three just say yea, so give 'em a point?

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay one point. Go 'head. Go to the next one.

MR. BALDWIN: The next one is promote interagency planning – comprehensive planning and interagency cooperation.

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Y'all agree with that?

[No verbal response.]

MR. BALDWIN: Dust abatement?

CHAIR SAVINO: No. We don't have anything to do with dust up there.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay. First level priorities. It does accomplish 50 percent of – designate is the first level. All the money is in that category, pretty much, so that would be 50 percent of the money. Okay at least three components? There are two components, correct? Five points. Individual support letters, group support letters?

CHAIR SAVINO: You didn't count there that one you said wasn't in in time from Whiplash? So you didn't put it into that category? Even though he said he put it in in time.

MR. BALDWIN: It was not received with the application.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, so it's not – it can't be counted.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, matching funds. So they have \$2,500. So that would be one point. On-the-ground components? They didn't – either of the high-priority items. identified by OHVAG – so that would be 27 total.

All right, so the next project on the list then is the Kingman Field Office Route Evaluations.

MS. ANTLE: Coconino?

[Pause due to problems with overhead PowerPoint.]

MR. BALDWIN: Coconino Munds Park. Okay, so Munds Park, OHV area improvements. Both items include gate installation, trailhead maintenance, trail maintenance, trail construction, naturalization – which I would assume would be the mitigation. All right? With that information in hand, does it do level one item A, protect access? Munds Park Trail Maintenance and Improvements, does it accomplish item – first-level item A?

CHORUS OF VOICES: No.

MR. BALDWIN: All right. How 'bout item B, Maintain and Renovate Trails?

MR. PFEIFER: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Item C, Mitigate and Restore Damage – I guess that's naturalization. Correct?

[No verbal response.]

MR. BALDWIN: Y'all agree with that?

MR. PFEIFER: I do.

MR. BALDWIN: Establish and designate motorized roads and trails – does it do that?

CHORUS OF VOICES: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: How does it do that?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

[Laughter.]

MR. FRENCH: I vote no.

MR. BALDWIN: NEPA or designation process –

MS. ANTLE: Okay, put zero.

MR. BALDWIN: TMR. results. All right. On-the-ground management presence – zero; install signs – it doesn't say that. No sign materials. Correct? Provide maps [unintelligible] information?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Provide educational programs?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: All right, develop support facilities?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: I believe gates are included under support facilities.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes – what do you want? I know, again –

MR. BALDWIN: Support facilities can include restrooms, parking, water faucets, picnic shelters, wildlife viewing – gates would be a renovation or a trail maintenance. Okay, so – all right, so no support facilities. Volunteerism? They have \$8,600 in match. Just because a project includes volunteers, does that promote volunteerism?

MR. PFEIFER: It would be nice if they had letters of –

MR. BALDWIN: This includes coordinated volunteerism – promoting that. You know the agency is providing staff time to get volunteers together to coordinate with some kind of organization to get volunteers on the scene, so – can I get a determination on that?

MR. FRENCH: What do you want?

MS. ANTLE: Well I think that – I think it has – promote volunteers.

MR. BALDWIN: I could do this just as John just explained in his project.

CHAIR SAVINO: Sure, blame it on John.

MR. BALDWIN: I mean you gave him a point, so –

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: What are they doing different?

MS. ANTLE: Well they've committed six volunteer workdays on these projects – MUTS, Munds Park Trails Stewards.

MR. BALDWIN: All right, so that – okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: Give 'em the point.

MR. BALDWIN: All right, promote comprehensive agency planning – that's not really part of the application, is it?

CHORUS OF VOICES: No.

MR. BALDWIN: And dust abatement, not an issue in Munds Park. Okay, and do they have – first-level priorities – that's where all the project is, trail maintenance renovation. Correct?

MS. ANTLE: Uhm hum.

MR. BALDWIN: Do they have three or more scope items? We marked three, yeah, signage – we know there were no signage – yeah, there's two there and one in the third category. So they have three items. Correct?

MS. ANTLE: Yep.

MR. BALDWIN: All right, any support letters?

MS. ANTLE: [Unintelligible] Munds Park Trail Stewards.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, and that would be a group. Correct?

MS. ANTLE: Right.

MR. BALDWIN: One group letter for three points. Okay match is – what's the percentage on the match? Ten thousand divided by –

CHAIR SAVINO: I beg to differ. Look – go back and look at this Munds Park Trail Stewards letter. They're not – that's a general letter. It's not specifically talking about this grant – promoting this grant. I found this on several occasions during this thing; one from a Mayor from Payson on another grant where it's just a generic letter that they're putting out there supporting the –

MR. PFEIFER: Responsible –

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, responsible park – Coconino National Forest and Munds Park Off-Highway Multi-Use Trail System. "The OHV Trail System is part of the Munds Park Roads and Trail Project," la, dee, da, da, dah. The Munds Park Trail System presented in the statewide OHV Program Funding Grant, so on and so forth. They not stating anything about this specific thing. They just threw this generic thing in there and that's not right. So you can't count that.

MR. BALDWIN: An area they've adopted and they're volunteering there.

CHAIR SAVINO: Where does it say they've adopted this area.

MR. BALDWIN: It says it's part of the Munds Park –

CHAIR SAVINO: Where do they say they approve it? You're saying that because I've adopted everything up in the White Mountains that if the Forest Service does a specific thing, then I'm promoting? You can't use my letter unless it's specific for that purpose; and that's what I'm saying here. They're using something that shouldn't be –

MR. BALDWIN: It's specific to the Munds Park Trails System Roads and Trails Project.

CHAIR SAVINO: But not –

MR. PFEIFER: The date on it's pretty current. It's March.

MS. ANTLE: Yeah, it's March 4th.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay – I don't care.

MR. BALDWIN: Consensus? Yes or no?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes – I don't care. I really, really don't care.

MR. BALDWIN: It's 13.8 percent – and that's two points under 14?

MS. ANTLE: Yeah.

MR. BALDWIN: And high priority items?

[Pause.]

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, did we miss trail construction as the scope item there? Trails Construction, \$10,000. That would be under "Maintain or Renovate Existing

Routes and Trails.” There really is no category for new trails. Although it could fall under – it doesn’t really say that –

CHAIR SAVINO: Let it be noted that at 4:11 p.m., we just lost our quorum.

MS. ANTLE: Did he leave?

REPORTER: I think he went to the men’s room.

MS. ANTLE: He left his stuff, so I hope he’s coming back.

CHAIR SAVINO: He’s coming -- he told me he has to take some aspirin. He’s got a headache like me. Joy’s given me a headache. Good work, Joy. You’re gonna get me for child endangerment I’m sure . . .

[Laughter.]

CHAIR SAVINO: . . . when it’s all said and done.

REPORTER: Can we go off the record, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR SAVINO: The child endangerment thing for sure!

[Laughter.]

CHAIR SAVINO: We have a quorum. You can start, Bob.

MR. BALDWIN: All right. Well let’s go back on this one for just a second. This [unintelligible] treats trailhead maintenance, so would that be a support facility, or would that just be part of “maintain and renovate existing trails and routes?” A trailhead isn’t a route – and we didn’t give any points for support facility.

MS. ANTLE: Well, they’re installing a gate.

MR. BALDWIN: Again, if you look at the scope items, gate installation, trailhead maintenance – then they separate trail construction and maintenance. So, trailhead would be related to support facilities – yes or no.

[No verbal response.]

MR. BALDWIN: Is everybody participating here?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, yes sir.

MS. ANTLE: Well if you’ve got a big gate at the trailhead, that would be part of the support facilities, wouldn’t it?

MR. BALDWIN: As opposed to the trail – okay.

MS. ANTLE: So we could give ‘em one under –

MR. BALDWIN: One under support facilities?

MS. ANTLE: Yeah. That gives them 18.

MR. BALDWIN: All right – so that would give them – [unintelligible] in the high priority – [inaudible]. So then they scored – in the bonus category four, matching funds they have – what’d I say, 13 – 13 percent, which is two points? Okay then

the OHVAG priorities – they have points in both high – both items. – those items. total – that’s a hundred percent of – almost a hundred percent.

MS. ANTLE: It would be five points?

MR. BALDWIN: Right. Okay? Most of their money’s being spent in the areas that OHVAG identified as important.

MS. HERNBRODE: Bob, can you go back and do just – run through the numbers on that number four, ‘cause I got lost at the switch on the screen. I’m completely confused.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, we’re on the Munds Park Project?

MS. HERNBRODE: Right.

CHAIR SAVINO: Second one.

MS. HERNBRODE: Yeah, so just read through those numbers for me would you?

CHAIR SAVINO: Zero, eight, eight, zero –

MS. HERNBRODE: Okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: Zero, zero, zero, zero.

MS. HERNBRODE: Okay.

MR. PFEIFER: It should be one on –

CHAIR SAVINO: One, one, zero, zero.

MS. HERNBRODE: Right, which gives them an 18, right?

CHAIR SAVINO: Eighteen. Then a 12, a zero, a nine, a zero, a zero, a three – two.

MS. HERNBRODE: And then?

CHAIR SAVINO: Five, for 31.

MS. HERNBRODE: Okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: So the total there is what?

MR. BALDWIN: Thirty-one?

MS. HERNBRODE: No, that was the total bonus. The total total.

CHAIR SAVINO: I’m getting sick of these.

[Laughter.]

CHAIR SAVINO: It’s making me dizzy.

MS. HERNBRODE: Why you think I asked you to read it. Thirty-eight.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, so they are jumping up to the top.

CHAIR SAVINO: Because it was 31 we had on there.

MR. FRENCH: If they’re moving up –

[Overlapping conversations pertaining to problems with overhead PowerPoint.]

MS. HERNBRODE: It should be 49 if my math is not horrible. Thirty-one bonus points for a total of all points of 49 for the Munds Park Project. You are, of course, relying on the women who went to law school to avoid math.

[Laughter.]

MR. FRENCH: Sounds like the best one here.

[Laughter.]

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, so the next one on the list is the Kingman Field Office Route Evaluations.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bob, just for your own safety, if you say at the end of this thing: "See how simple this was?" I may come across this table at you, okay.

[Laughter.]

MS. HERNBRODE: He was right, though, it is getting easier.

CHAIR SAVINO: For who?

MS. HERNBRODE: It's going faster.

MR. BALDWIN: All right, in the application form they identify [unintelligible] cost sheet, advance resource resolution contract, \$30,000; and then matching the money from BLM and Game and Fish of \$3,350; travel and management planning aims to satisfy mission goals; every [unintelligible] expected – okay, the three remaining units, local clubs [unintelligible] – all right, so, basically this application is asking for funds to designate routes [unintelligible], right?

CHAIR SAVINO: Correct.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, so – all right, so, is it acquiring property?

CHORUS OF VOICES: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Does it maintain or renovate existing trails? Does it mitigate any resource damage?

CHORUS OF VOICES: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, does it establish or designate motorized routes?

MR. PFEIFER: No.

MR. BALDWIN: That's the purpose of the evaluation, isn't it?

MR. FRENCH: It inventory routes, but it's not gonna –

MR. BALDWIN: Finalize travel management plans – [unintelligible] would successfully designate off-highway vehicle routes to be able to provide educational materials such as kiosks – that's on the grant application form in the project description. Y'all see that? Eleven 1(d), does this establish or designate motorized trails or routes?

CHORUS OF VOICES: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Increase on-the-ground presence, provide and install trail signs, provide maps, provide educational programs, involve support facilities, promote and coordinate volunteerism?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Promote comprehensive planning and interagency coordination?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah – yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Yes? Y'all agree yes?

MS. ANTLE: Yes.

MR. PFEIFER: Yeah.

MR. BALDWIN: [Unintelligible.] All right, then there –

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: A hundred percent of this is all second levels.

MS. ANTLE: Yep.

MR. BALDWIN: So, it would get eight points.

MS. ANTLE: It's all first level.

MR. BALDWIN: Oh, designate is first level, right. Three components?

CHORUS OF VOICES: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Two components – yes?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Any support letters?

MS. ANTLE: No, I don't think so.

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: No support letters?

CHAIR SAVINO: Did I see some in there? I don't think so. No, they referenced –

MS. PULSIFER: Wait, wait, wait, that should be a five, not a two.

MS. ANTLE: Yes, you're right. Two components is a five – yep.

MR. BALDWIN: And they do have match.

[End of tape.]

MR. BALDWIN: . . . versus 30,000 – 33,000. So that would be –

CHAIR SAVINO: So, what'd you come up with?

MR. BALDWIN: Just over 10 percent, so that would be two points?

MS. ANTLE: Yep.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay and do any of these first-level of priorities affect priorities?
Twenty-eight total points.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MR. BALDWIN: What's the next one on the list here, Kingman Field Office – or Havasu. Okay. Their scope item sheet looks a little different, but they have signs and decals, \$93,000; [unintelligible] access guide, \$10,000; access guide layout, \$5,000; project coordination, \$9,600; volunteer time and materials – I don't see any breakdown of what those are.

MS. ANTLE Well, it says on the front page: "BLM will work with volunteers from local OHV groups to sign technical vehicle sites."

MR. BALDWIN: So they're gonna provide help with signing?

MS. ANTLE: Yeah.

MR. BALDWIN: All right. Is it gonna acquire property?

MS. ANTLE: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, maintain or renovate trails?

MS. ANTLE: No, I don't think so.

MR. BALDWIN: Mitigate, restore damage?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Establish, designate trails?

MS. ANTLE: I would say yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, so they're gonna have their plan finished. There's no money in here to do their plans, so there's not any -- they're not designating. Once they are designated they're gonna sign it. That was part of the issue with funding this is the discussion was because they weren't gonna have their designation for a while – so this project does not provide any funds to designate or establish routes. You all agree with that?

MS. ANTLE: Yep, that's right.

MR. BALDWIN: Increase on-the-ground management?

MS. ANTLE: No.

MR. PFEIFER: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Provide signage?

MS. ANTLE: Yep.

MR. BALDWIN: Maps?

CHORUS OF VOICES: Yep.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay. Education programs?

MS. ANTLE: Maps education?

MR. BALDWIN: No, it's not an education program.

MS. ANTLE: Okay.

MR. BALDWIN: All right, and there's no support facilities. Promote coordinated volunteerism – they do have volunteers participating. Correct?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Comprehensive planning?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Do they have first level – they had no first level, did they?

CHAIR SAVINO: None.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, and the second-level was –

CHAIR SAVINO: Nine points they give.

MR. BALDWIN: That's where all their cost is, so that's at least 50 percent of the project cost. Right? So they would get eight points there? Y'all agree?

CHORUS OF VOICES: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: All right. They do have three components.

MS. ANTLE: They did?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah.

MR. BALDWIN: Any support letters?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay. Matching funds? Five thousand out of \$122,000.

MR. PFEIFER: One percent?

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, one point for match. All right. And did they do any of the OHVAG priorities? No. Correct?

CHAIR SAVINO: Correct.

MR. BALDWIN: Twenty-seven points? All right, Game and Fish next – statewide access?

MS. ANTLE: What do you know, we're halfway through.

CHORUS OF VOICES: More than halfway through.

MS. ANTLE: I wanted to hit the – over the halfway.

[Laughter.]

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, Game and Fish.

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: This project is to do a study which will provide information for law enforcement. And again – had a grant writer – so, obviously, this project fit in every category.

MS. ANTLE: Or not.

CHAIR SAVINO: According to them it did.

MR. BALDWIN: All right, so the scope of this includes: develop questionnaire, conduct survey, prepare reports, education and enforcement – so that would be, based on the results of the study – all right. Acquire property?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Maintain trails?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Mitigate –

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: . . . damage? Establish –

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: . . . designated –

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

[Laughter.]

MR. BALDWIN: . . . trails?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Law enforcement?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Isn't that what the education and enforcement item –

CHAIR SAVINO: No, they're just doing a survey. They're doing a survey. It has nothing to do with law enforcement. Just because they're a law enforcement agency – they're doing a survey to see what kind of law enforcement they may or may not – may or may need.

MR. FRENCH: Survey is all it is.

MS. ANTLE: It's got education and enforcement.

MR. PFEIFER: The scope item has education and enforcement.

CHAIR SAVINO: No, wait a minute.

MR. FRENCH: It's not.

CHAIR SAVINO: Don't read what they're saying on their thing because you'll have yes on every category. They're – it's still a survey. They're saying, "Yeah, if you look into the survey, when it's all done, maybe it'll take care of this." You have to look at it for what it's worth and it's still a survey – period.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, and the last second – in the second to the last paragraph on the second page, "The implementation phase of using the data to promote public safety through focus, law enforcement and education efforts will continue through 2014." That's the way they're gonna spend the \$12,000.

CHAIR SAVINO: I mean, what does that have to do with the price of tea in China?

MR. BALDWIN: Well it has to do with this item up here called, "Increase on-the-ground presence and law enforcement."

CHAIR SAVINO: They – it's a survey. They're just doing a survey – period.

MR. BALDWIN: Their scope of work –

CHAIR SAVINO: They're asking for money for a survey.

MR. BALDWIN: Their scope of work includes education and enforcement. They define that on the bottom – in this paragraph as implementation of the phase of – "using the data to promote public safety through focus, law enforcement and education efforts will continue through 2012." They're gonna use the survey information and do the law enforcement.

CHAIR SAVINO: Possibly they are. You know, you can read it – however you wanna put it, Bob, we're back to where, if you want a project, you're gonna put the spin on it like you want it; so, I could care less.

MR. BALDWIN: The whole process – the whole object of this process is to identify what these criteria involve; and when you read the grant application you can only assume that that's what they intend to do is what they put out on the paper.

CHAIR SAVINO: Then put a cat – put yes in every category because according to their sheet they put yes on everything, so, they intend to do it all. You wanna go that route?

MR. FRENCH: Let's move on.

MR. BALDWIN: I want you to use the process that we're using, evaluate what they've given us with their scope items and how they define what they're gonna do with those scope items and see how that fits into these categories. That's what I'm asking you to do.

CHAIR SAVINO: You want us to put a four there, I'll put a four there, Bob.

MR. BALDWIN: Again, it's consensus of the group. Does the group agree to put four there?

CHAIR SAVINO: No, I don't.

MR. BALDWIN: Does anyone agree to put four there?

MR. PFEIFER: I tend to agree with you, John. It seems more like a conjecture.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, you're just – you can throw it out there with us forever. You have to beg –

[Unintelligible, overlapping, heated debate.]

CHAIR SAVINO: You cannot argue with us, Bob! You're here to just tell us the thing. We're talking among ourselves!

MR. BALDWIN: I'm only questioning your logic.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. I am talk – we're talking among our group right now. You asked us to come up with a – the points, and we are. We're discussing it among us. We're not asking for your input at this time, thank you.

I'm thinking that it's a – it's a survey. That's all they're asking for is the survey. You – you can't put in there what is all on there. It still gets back to that survey. So, with that said, how do you –

MS. ANTLE: If you have law enforcement officers on the ground out there doing the survey, you have on-the-ground – you've got 40 hours of it right there – seven officers.

MR. BALDWIN: So you're gonna total ignore the fact that they've allocated \$12,000 and they've identified that using the survey dollars they're gonna "focus law enforcement and education efforts?"

CHAIR SAVINO: I am. That's why I'm saying zero now. Whether you say something – whether the other three members say something else, that's their – up to them and then we'll go by the majority.

MS. PULSIFER: The intent of the survey is to identify safety enforcement actions needed.

CHAIR SAVINO: *Identify!*

MS. PULSIFER: Identify 'em – but they're not – if they're gonna identify 'em the intent is to use 'em.

CHAIR SAVINO: No! What if they say that it's not!

MS. PULSIFER: [Unintelligible.]

[Unintelligible, overlapping, heated debate.]

CHAIR SAVINO: What if the survey comes back and says, "Well, we decided we identified it and it's not needed." Well then you've just blown your theory down the drain because then it's not gonna be used. All it is a survey to identify it. Now from there you take it to the next step. But it's just identify.

MS. PULSIFER: It's not to identify not to determine whether they're needed or not; it's to identify what is needed.

CHAIR SAVINO: Then all the more reason.

MS. PULSIFER: And then it won't be developed.

CHAIR SAVINO: I say zero. You guys say what you want. Say whatever you want.

MR. FRENCH: I'll say whatever we need to move on.

[Laughter.]

CHAIR SAVINO: It's a joke! This is ridiculous.

MR. FRENCH: I'm telling you right now –

CHAIR SAVINO: This totally a joke!

MR. FRENCH: This thing is so convoluted –

CHAIR SAVINO: Let's put a four down there if it'll make everybody happy. Go on.

MR. BALDWIN: Does the group concur that it's four or zero?

[Pause.]

MR. PFEIFER: What do you think, Becky?

MS. ANTLE: I think four.

MR. PFEIFER: Four?

MS. ANTLE: but you know –

MR. PFEIFER: All right.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, well [unintelligible].

MS. ANTLE: I think differently.

MR. PFEIFER: We'll go with four.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I want it just to be noted I say a zero. Okay, go to the next one.

MR. BALDWIN: Is that group consensus, four?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. PFEIFER: Don, what do you think?

MR. FRENCH: I'm with John, and I'm not agreeing with John to be agreeing with John. I just don't see the – somewhere back here – I think it was on one of these other projects. I think Kingman or something you say –

MS. HERNBRODE: It sounds like the con – sounds like the majority is zero on that category, so –

MR. BALDWIN: Install signs, no; provide education programs –

CHAIR SAVINO: How 'bout, "provide maps and trail route information," zero? See?

MR. PFEIFER: Right.

MS. ANTLE: Correct.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay and then, "Provide educational programs?"

MR. FRENCH: No.

CHAIR SAVINO: I say still it's a survey, no.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, so, zero on providing educational programs?

CHAIR SAVINO: That's what I say.

MR. BALDWIN: Develop support facilities; promote coordinated – promote comprehensive interagency planning?

CHAIR SAVINO: I put a one for that.

MR. BALDWIN: They do talk about sharing the information with other law enforcement agencies.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, so I give it a one, and zero for dust abatement.

MR. BALDWIN: Dust abatement? Okay so it does not accomplish –

MS. ANTLE: You got no bonus.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, so the majority of the money is in second level.

MS. ANTLE: Third level. All of the money's there.

MR. BALDWIN: All of the money's in third level. Okay. Not three components or two?

MS. ANTLE: Nope.

MR. BALDWIN: Support letters –

MS. ANTLE: Nope.

MR. BALDWIN: ... in there? The match is \$13,000 out of \$120,000 – you doing those Doris?

MS. ANTLE: I think you're on the bottom there.

CHAIR SAVINO: We're on the bottom one, yeah.

MS. PULSIFER: Thirteen out of – that would be – it could be a one.

MR. BALDWIN: Thirteen thousand out of -- \$13,800 out of –

MS. PULSIFER: That's a one.

MR. BALDWIN: One, okay. Accomplishes no OHVAG priority items – project scores two points. Okay? All right, we got Vulture Mountain, Maricopa County. All right, we've got the application form with their description. Again, they had a grant writer. You can tell. Okay. Okay, scope item breakdown indicates scoping – it's basically a NEPA assessment with no on-the-ground work at all. Y'all agree with that?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay. They do have one item outside the NEPA assessment which is the RPP patent, which is the acquisition of property. Are y'all familiar with the patent process? You know what that's all about?

[No verbal response.]

MR. BALDWIN: BLM can make land available for recreational purposes to other governmental entities through –

MS. ANTLE: The Recreation Public Purposes Act.

MR. BALDWIN: Basically --

CHAIR SAVINO: Provided it still fits in their TMP, correct? It still has to fit into their TMP.

MR. GIBSON: You're thinking of the R and P, Resource Management Plan.

CHAIR SAVINO: Travel Management Plan – yeah, all right – yeah.

MR. BALDWIN: What the –

CHAIR SAVINO: It still has to fit into that, doesn't it?

MR. GIBSON: It does have to be recommended to the land-use planning process, yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: So even though they've – they've acquired that land, if there isn't any trails made available by BLM to that land, what good is that land?

MR. GIBSON: Then you are [unintelligible]. The R and P process authorizes and R and P action to be done in a given area.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MR. GIBSON: That R and P was done three years ago.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, but how 'bout the trails leading into that area and out of that area?

MR. GIBSON: That is a second level or implementation level decision or travel management plan decision.

CHAIR SAVINO: Where does that stand?

MR. GIBSON: That has not been completed yet.

MS. HERNBRODE: For the record, Mr. Chairman, that was –

CHAIR SAVINO: Bill Gibson.

[Laughter.]

MR. GIBSON: Was I speaking outta turn?

MS. HERNBRODE: No, I just wanna make sure – it's for the record.

So they're talking about getting an R and PP Patent, which is an acquisition action.

MR. FRENCH: RPP?

MS. HERNBRODE: R and P, Recreation and Public Purposes.

MR. FRENCH: R and P.

MS. HERNBRODE: Uhm hum.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MR. BALDWIN: So part of that is to do the NEPA assessment on the property they're acquiring. Correct? So then the only other – it's not necessarily designating specific routes.

MS. HERNBRODE: So where the NEPA is to establish routes you put it under D where the NEPA is to acquire property you put it under A.

MR. BALDWIN: But it is to acquire a property for an OHV area, right?

MR. GIBSON: The R and P process does not – does not designate routes, correct.

MR. FRENCH: My question real quick, too – this funds an environmental assessment in preparation for the development of an OHV facility. So, again, it's an environmental assessment. That's all we're funding, right?

MR. GIBSON: Yes.

MR. FRENCH: We need to keep that in mind. It's not acquiring new land, it's an assessment that –

MR. BALDWIN: That portion of it is strictly assessment. The \$100 R and P Patent is an acquisition.

MR. FRENCH: They're actually gonna do that before the assessment?

MR. BALDWIN: They're gonna do that as part of this project. If they have to complete the assessment first before they can spend the hundred dollars, then that's what they're gonna do.

MR. FRENCH: Oh, okay.

MR. BALDWIN: So, other than that, no other categories?

MR. FRENCH: What have we got, aid on eight?

MR. BALDWIN: Interagency planning and cooperation, Maricopa County and BLM? It's environmental assessment.

MS. HERNBRODE: Right, but it's an environmental assessment not to establish trails, but to acquire property.

MR. BALDWIN: Future trails.

MR. FRENCH: Well –

MR. BALDWIN: Where else are you gonna put environmental assessment?

MS. HERNBRODE: Under A for the acquisition.

MS. ANTLE: Wouldn't that go under D?

MR. BALDWIN: You wanna show direct relationship to developing trails.

MS. HERNBRODE: Right it's just – they're acquiring prop – it's part of the process – you give somebody an eight under D because – when they're doing a NEPA to do trails because it's part of the process to getting a trail.

MS. ANTLE: Because they're figuring out where they going to put the trails and stuff. For this one you're giving them an eight under the "acquire" because this is a part of the process for acquisition.

MS. HERNBRODE: Okay.

MS. ANTLE: Not for – not for the next phase which will be the trails which will be another NEPA, I would assume.

MR. BALDWIN: All right, so that's all first level stuff. That's the only points they got. Three components, no. Two components, no. Are we – how 'bout interagency planning? Did you give them any points there?

MS. ANTLE: Well, they've got – they're working with Maricopa County Parks and BLM? No.

CHAIR SAVINO: That's not an interagency if they're – interagency means between two agencies, not between a private and –

MS. ANTLE: Maricopa County is an agency.

CHAIR SAVINO: Parks is considered an agency?

MS. HERNBRODE: It is. Maricopa County – it's a governmental entity.

MS. ANTLE: So they should get one under that?

MR. BALDWIN: You agree? Okay. So they did have two scope items, then? Okay, any support letters?

MS. ANTLE: There's a letter, but it's not in support.

[Laughter.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, do they get negative points?

[Laughter.]

MR. BALDWIN: Okay they had a \$10,000 match out of \$80,000. That'd be 'bout 16 percent? So that would be – what is that? That's over the –

MS. ANTLE: Five.

MR. BALDWIN: Five points. Okay, no OHVAG priorities? Thirty-one points total?

MS. ANTLE: Three more to go.

CHAIR SAVINO: Two more actually. There's one recused themselves. We got rid of it.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, American Conservation Experience, Mazatzal Wilderness Boundary Signing.

MR. FRENCH: We shouldn't do that. Where are we at, nine?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, nine. While we're on this thing, did this – anybody know whether this area was affected by that fire?

MR. BALDWIN: I think it's further north and west is where the fire – it's across the highway, up in the mountains, up on the – well the base of the Mazatzal is on the west side of 87. I don't think that fire's gotten –

CHAIR SAVINO: I do know the fire got in the Mazatzal area.

MR. BALDWIN: Did it get across the 87? I don't know.

MS. ANTLE: What Bill was telling me it's just – so far it's to what, Reserve?

MR. GIBSON: [Unintelligible.]

MR. BALDWIN: Yeah this is further north, I believe.

MR. GIBSON: You're thinking of the Sunflower fire.

MS. ANTLE: Okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: So your answer is, no, it doesn't affect this?

MR. BALDWIN: Well we'll find out. If they can't use the money to go in there and do the work, then they can't use it. I mean, if the area's closed off because of the fire –

MS. ANTLE: We get to keep the money.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MR. BALDWIN: There will be no work done. Okay, so – all right, again, the project is to identify and enforce the wilderness boundaries. And install wilderness access barriers and signage; wilderness boundary survey – survey meaning, on-a-site survey – wilderness boundary survey. Okay, so no acquisition there, correct?

MS. ANTLE: Right.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, correct.

MR. BALDWIN: No trail maintenance?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Mitigation?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Everybody agree, mitigation?

MS. ANTLE: Mitigation?

MR. BALDWIN: Establish and designate?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. FRENCH: No, it doesn't restore.

MR. BALDWIN: [Unintelligible]. All right. Provide signage?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes, it provides signage.

MR. BALDWIN: Y'all agree there?

MS. ANTLE: Does it provide signage for trail route signs, or just – were there route signs in here or just wilderness signs?

CHAIR SAVINO: Actually signage saying: "Keep out!"

MS. ANTLE: Right.

CHAIR SAVINO: Now, that's not considered trail route signs.

MS. ANTLE: That's why I'm asking that.

CHAIR SAVINO: It's not really so that's a zero.

MS. HERNBRODE: What does the definition say?

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, it says, "Install locator signs that lead people to trailheads, parking areas, directional signs along the trail; destination signs to let people know where they reach the end, interpretative signs that describe natural and cultural areas; educational signs explaining why environmental and cultural protections are required, regulatory signs that explain the rule of conduct" – I think it falls under those categories.

CHAIR SAVINO: No, it doesn't.

MS. HERNBRODE: It might fall under regulatory signs.

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, what's –

MS. HERNBRODE: How to drive your OHV over here – that's the rule of conduct.

MR. BALDWIN: Educational signs that explain why environmental and cultural protections are required – it's a wilderness.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, four points.

MR. BALDWIN: Education programs, no.

CHAIR SAVINO: How 'bout the C? What did we say?

MS. HERNBRODE: No.

CHAIR SAVINO: Zero. Okay, D?

MS. ANTLE: No.

MR. BALDWIN: D is educational programs.

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Support facilities?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Volunteerism?

CHAIR SAVINO: No, because we're paying them to do it. So there is no volunteer. We wish it was.

MR. FRENCH: And the answer is?

CHAIR SAVINO: No!

MR. BALDWIN: Interagency coordination? Dust Abatement? Okay, level one priorities?

MR. PFEIFER: Was it 50 percent – install boundary signage.

MR. BALDWIN: Seventy-five thousand. Correct? Three components, they have two components, correct?

MS. ANTLE: Correct.

MR. BALDWIN: Any support letters? And I agree, John that one that's from the City of Payson is not relative to anything here.

CHAIR SAVINO: Thank you.

MR. BALDWIN: Although the Pine Strawberry Fuel Reduction –

CHAIR SAVINO: That is.

MR. BALDWIN: That is relative. Okay, would you consider that a group or an individual?

CHAIR SAVINO: I consider it an individual myself.

MS. ANTLE: It's supposed to be a business, right? They're not part of our group anymore.

MR. BALDWIN: Without a clear – I mean on all these letters they're encouraged to identify their rela – their membership, how many people they have, et cetera; and if it's not clear, then we can't – okay, so here's one, individual support letter?

CHAIR SAVINO: Right.

MR. BALDWIN: Matching funds? They're providing \$9,000 out of \$89,000 – ten percent? It's more than nine, right, but not 14?

MS. ANTLE: Fourteen is two.

MR. BALDWIN: OHVAG priorities – no. Right?

CHAIR SAVINO: Right. Thirty-two total.

MR. BALDWIN: Arizona Strip Travel Management.

[Pause.]

CHAIR SAVINO: How can we even look at this one when we told them at the last meeting when they were present that we were gonna – and they agreed – that

they were gonna pull this back and re-submit it without the – the travel management coordinator's position on there; and also the two intern positions?

MR. BALDWIN: There's nothing ineligible about what they've provided. In the determination of whether or not you wanna fund them and you wanna raise those issues, you can certainly do it at that time. The application is eligible. All the scope items are eligible.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Bill.

MR. GIBSON: I've been authorized to speak on behalf of the Arizona Strip. They will withdraw that request for the –

CHAIR SAVINO: For the management, okay. Great!

MR. BALDWIN: All right, so in the project costs, that will be the third item under task one, \$91,099.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, and then also, do they want to remove the task two, SCA interns for \$20,000 – or for \$48,000?

MR. GIBSON: I don't think they do because those are not direct hires. Those are done through the Youth Conservation Force.

CHAIR SAVINO: Gotcha!

MR. BALDWIN: All right, so –

CHAIR SAVINO: And also the other question we had was – we had in question with them was the utility trailer – do they wanna keep that in there for \$18,000?

MR. GIBSON: Utility trailer?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah a Ranger – a UTV – no, a Ranger UTV with a trailer. They wanted the UTV and the trailer for \$18,233.

MR. GIBSON: I believe they still want that, but if it's out of the – if you deem it inappropriate they can live without it.

CHAIR SAVINO: In other words you want it, no matter –

MR. GIBSON: We just don't want that [unintelligible] –

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MR. GIBSON: They'll go along with that.

MR. FRENCH: That the total amount on that.

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, without that? I don't know. It was seven hundred and something thousand. Look.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, again, based on the information that Joy provided concerning grant terminology and processes, okay, they've done what we've asked them to do is identify all the costs to complete this project. And the portion that they do not want reimbursement for includes a lot of their staff time, which as she mentioned, as long as it's dedicated to accomplishing this project, is

eligible project cost. All right, so they have route evaluation designation, route implementation on the ground, public website information, print maps – supported by a cost of breakdown on all those items – all right –

MR. FRENCH: So can you tell me what they're basically asking for with taking out that \$91,000? What would be the cost on this?

MR. BALDWIN: Well the total cost would be \$655,000 – total project cost; and of that you would reduce the grant request by – that was in grant item – by \$91,009; so it would be \$300 and -- \$218,000 – \$219,000.

CHAIR SAVINO: So they're asking for in your scope on – cost sheet on page five – they're asking for task one as BLM staff time –

MS. ANTEL: That's a match.

CHAIR SAVINO: That's a match. Excuse me, okay. So they're asking for route evaluation, \$50,000; then on down to \$15,000 for supplies and you know materials -- \$35,000 for information kiosk and then \$60,000 for printing. Correct.

MS. HERNBRODE: Mr. Chairman, you skipped the interns. They do want the SPA interns.

MR. BALDWIN: Well, they're matching that.

MS. HERNBRODE: Oh, I'm sorry.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah. So then the \$60,000 for printing – so they're asking for this, this, this –

MR. BALDWIN: Basically, I mean, they're asking you to approve the project. The project includes their match, which is part of the whole cost of the thing. So when you look at a scope item, that scope item includes whatever they're donating or matching in kind; and whatever they're asking for for grant purposes.

MR. FRENCH: Yeah, I guess what I'm ask – I'm confused on the amount they're asking for on this project.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, again, the amount would be everything except \$91,099.80.

MR. FRENCH: And the original amount was?

MR. BALDWIN: Ninety-one thousand, one hundred dollars. So, that's being struck. That would be deleted from the total project cost and from the grant request.

MR. PFEIFER: So the grant request is \$317,918 minus that?

MR. BALDWIN: Minus that, correct.

MR. FRENCH: So it'd still be around \$220,000. Okay, that's what I –

MR. BALDWIN: Okay? All right, so – no acquisition, correct? No trail maintenance or renovation.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay – no.

MS. HERNBRODE: Anybody?

CHAIR SAVINO: Are you waiting for – oh. We –

MR. BALDWIN: I need somebody to tell me what the consensus is.

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Mitigate, restore damage?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

MR. FRENCH: No.

CHAIR SAVINO: No?

MR. FRENCH: No.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, no.

MR. BALDWIN: Establish designated routes?

CHORUS OF VOICES: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Increase on-the-ground presence?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Provide, install signs?

MR. FRENCH: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

MR. FRENCH: Signage, maps, kiosk.

MR. BALDWIN: Kiosk and maps, too?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Provide maps?

MS. ANTLE: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Provide educational programs?

MS. ANTLE: Yes.

MR. FRENCH: No.

MR. BALDWIN: What is that?

MS. ANTLE: Public website – wouldn't that be considered educational programs?

CHAIR SAVINO: It's information maps. That education – information maps to me isn't education.

MR. BALDWIN: An educational program is when you develop a process to present information to the public or someone.

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MS. ANTLE: Zero.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay. Support facilities?

MR. FRENCH: Yes.

MS. ANTLE: Within a kiosk?

MR. FRENCH: It says right on there.

CHAIR SAVINO: Informational kiosk worth \$70,000.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay – kiosk, okay, that is support facility. Volunteer coordinators?

MR. FRENCH: Naw!

MR. BALDWIN: No.

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Interagency planning?

MR. FRENCH: Nope.

MR. BALDWIN: All of the agencies on there are under BLM or the Department of Interior, so that would be *intra*-agencies.

CHAIR SAVINO: Seventeen points?

MR. BALDWIN: It was the different management areas.

MR. PFEIFER: Oh, okay.

MR. BALDWIN: Do we see any –

CHAIR SAVINO: No first-level priorities – I don't know.

MR. PFEIFER: No, there's no reference of Game and Fish involvement.

MR. BALDWIN: All right so that would be [unintelligible], first level. Most of the cost is for the designation, correct?

CHORUS OF VOICES: Yeah.

MR. PFEIFER: Second level.

MS. ANTLE: Second level or first level.

MR. BALDWIN: The designation is first level, sorry. That would be 12 points. At least three components. Yes?

CHORUS OF VOICES: Yep.

MR. BALDWIN: Any support letters?

MS. ANTLE: Nope.

MR. BALDWIN: Matching funds? Yes? That's 50 percent, right.

MS. ANTLE: It's over 50 so that's five?

MR. BALDWIN: OHVAG priorities? Signage is – how much is the signage? On-the-ground implementation, markers, stickers -- \$240,000 is the route implementation, on-the-ground signage. Correct? And that would be a third of the total project. So what is the value for the match –

MS. ANTLE: How did you say? Sixty percent or 80 percent?

MR. BALDWIN: Look at the signage scope item, on-the-ground implementation.

MS. ANTLE: Okay.

MR. BALDWIN: And that include \$241,000.

CHAIR SAVINO: Their match if \$426,000.

MR. FRENCH: They're only asking for \$200,000.

CHAIR SAVINO: They're only asking for –

MR. BALDWIN: And that's about a third –

MS. ANTLE: They know how to match.

MR. BALDWIN: . . . about a third of total project cost. Right?

MS. ANTLE: Forty percent or 60 percent?

MR. BALDWIN: It's a third, so, less than 40.

MS. ANTLE: Less than 40 – up to 40 is two.

MR. BALDWIN: Isn't that right? Two hundred forty out of 600? Actually you're reducing that 600 to – that 700 by \$90,000 -- \$91,000. Right? So what is \$241,000 divided by \$653,000? Is it over 40 percent or less than 40?

MS. PULSIFER: Less than 40.

MS. ANTLE: Well less than 40 is two – yeah, two – up to 40 is two.

[Pause.]

MR. BALDWIN: Stoneman Lake, Coconino Red Rock District.

MS. ANTLE: Last one.

MR. PFEIFER: We did go faster.

MS. ANTLE: Yeah once you figure it out. It's just a pain in the butt to do any of this.

MR. BALDWIN: All right. Cost breakdown sheets indicate public involvement which is scoping, part of a NEPA process, and on-the-ground improvements, trailhead improvements, signage and road repair. Y'all see that?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yep.

MR. BALDWIN: So, any acquisition?

CHORUS OF VOICES: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Maintain and renovate trails?

MS. ANTLE: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Mitigate, restore damage to areas surrounding trails routes areas.

MR. PFEIFER: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Including an installment lake overlook as part of it. What's that scope item say? Destination improvements, road grading, picnic tables, grills, [unintelligible] corridor, fencing – fencing is a mitigation item – debris removal – so a portion of that destination improvements would be mitigation?

MS. ANTLE: Uhm hum. So we got eight for that.

MR. PFEIFER: Yep.

MR. BALDWIN: Did I hear a yea on that?

CHORUS OF VOICES: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Designate? No.

CHORUS OF VOICES: No.

MR. BALDWIN: [Unintelligible] presence?

CHORUS OF VOICES: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Provide signage?

MS. ANTLE: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: You have signage there, \$50,000.

MS. ANTLE: Yep.

MR. BALDWIN: Maps and trail route information?

MS. ANTLE: No.

MR. PFEIFER: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Education programs?

MS. ANTLE: No.

MR. PFEIFER: No.

MR. BALDWIN: Improvements to the support facility, trailhead overlook?

MS. ANTLE: Okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah.

MR. BALDWIN: Three?

CHORUS OF VOICES: Yep.

MR. PFEIFER: Volunteers?

MS. ANTLE: No. I didn't see any support letters in there either.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay volunteer coordinator – coordinate volunteerism? Any volunteer items on any of these scope items? On the match page we don't have any donations. No volunteer involvement. Interagency planning?

MS. ANTLE: They're gonna do good on the letters here.

MR. BALDWIN: Dust abatement?

MR. PFEIFER: No.

MR. BALDWIN: High level of [unintelligible] items, mitigation – it's only a small part of that designation improvements and the – oh the public involvement. We skipped that. I guess that would be part of the mitigation since it's a NEPA process. So that would be a first-level D.

MS. ANTLE: Wait a minute.

MS. HERNBRODE: It's gonna respond to the mitigation which is C.

[End of tape.]

CHAIR SAVINO: How can a public meeting that they have with the public at the high school – local high school be anything considered around, even closely related to a NEPA study?

MS. HERNBRODE: It's required as part of the NEPA process. They have to contact the public and talk to them about what they're doing.

CHAIR SAVINO: That's gotta fall back on them. I mean, why should we have to – I don't –

MR. BALDWIN: If it's an eligible part of NEPA and NEPA is eligible. So, that's the determination. Is it part of NEPA?

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Yes – along those lines, yes.

MR. BALDWIN: You might recall a conversation was concerning a existing, single-track trail system in the Camp Verde area that they wanted to legitimize, so they needed to do NEPA; and this was the first step in that process.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Fine. It falls under there.

MR. BALDWIN: Does that ring a bell?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes, let's go.

MS. ANTLE: So does that give them an add –

MR. BALDWIN: Yes.

MS. HERNBRODE: We're adding eight points in first-level, priority D. Is that what I'm hearing from you OHVAG?

MR. PFEIFER: Yes, it's part of NEPA.

MR. FRENCH: On D?

MS. HERNBRODE: If that's the right project.

MR. BALDWIN: So in first level they have points in B, C and D. In second level they have points in B. In third level they have points in A.

MS. ANTLE: For a total of –

CHAIR SAVINO: Twenty-nine?

MR. BALDWIN: Plus their first level – most of their project is first-level priority. Correct?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes, so they get 12 points.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, they have at least three components. Correct?

CHORUS OF VOICES: Yep.

MR. BALDWIN: Were there any support letters? They had a bunch of them.

MS. ANTLE: Yeah, the only question I have is do you consider businesses a group or do you consider them individual? I thought the last one we considered them individual. I think Jeep Tours is a business, so that would be a business.

MR. FRENCH: As one?

MS. ANTLE: I don't know about Blue Ribbon. Is Blue Ribbon – they're not really a business.

MR. PFEIFER: No.

MS. ANTLE: Well then they would have one and six.

MR. BALDWIN: One individual letter and two group letters?

MS. ANTLE: We have actually one, two – four group letters.

CHAIR SAVINO: We've got Verde Valley Four Wheelers.

MS. ANTLE: But you're only going to get up to six points. So you'd have six points for that.

MR. BALDWIN: All right. Matching funds? Calculate that Doris? Match is 15 out of 165. Okay, [unintelligible]. They do sports facility development and distant trails. The amount for those was \$25,000 and road maintenance was \$63,000. So that's eighty-some thousand. That's more than half.

MS. ANTLE: More than half up to 60 over 40?

MR. BALDWIN: The total is 165 and they have 85.

MS. PULSIFER: It's two points.

MS. ANTLE: Two points so it's under 40.

MR. BALDWIN: It's over 50 percent.

MS. ANTLE: Then it's three points. From 40 to 60 is three.

MR. BALDWIN: So it's not 60 percent? Did you calculate that?

MS. ANTLE: Well, if it's over 40 it's three, up to 60.

MR. PFEIFER: I don't think it's over 60.

MR. BALDWIN: Fifty-three percent.

MS. ANTLE: Then it's three.

MR. BALDWIN: Thank you.

MS. HERNBRODE: Somebody else who can do math?

[Pause.]

CHAIR SAVINO: This is so ridiculous. I cannot believe it. While we're having these points added up I just want to go on record and state that this is the most ridiculous thing I've ever come across in my entire life. I have no idea and I will go on record to say it's a wonder why State Parks has problems. If this is the way it's operated, I'm sorry, but it's not the real world.

MR. BALDWIN: All right. You can go through the – on your sheets should be the columns with the requested money and then suggested breakdown, RTP, et cetera – and look through the projects and if there were items that you wanted to delete, scope items that you wanted to take out, then we would need to adjust those –

MR. FRENCH: Can we do that? Can we randomly –

MS. HERNBRODE: Now that you've scored them – I mean, it changes the score if you take out scope items.

MR. FRENCH: That's what I'm thinking. I don't know how – and we'd have to get permission from the – wouldn't we have to ask if they're willing to do that? Like we did BLM there, "are you willing to take out this line item?"

MS. HERNBRODE: It would be the fairest thing, because otherwise you're offering them a "take-it-or-leave-it" situation.

CHAIR SAVINO: So it's all or nothing.

MR. FRENCH: [Unintelligible.]

MS. HERNBRODE: Well, you know, they're not here to say "yes or no, I'm willing to do that," so, you know – you can take them out, we'd need to re-score it and then they'd have to – they'd have to say, "Yes, we're willing to do that," or "No, we won't take this grant."

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. So where do we go? How do you wanna handle this. We have them listed how we're gonna have 'em; and I'd like to go down –

MR. FRENCH: You're not running this meeting.

CHAIR SAVINO: What

MR. FRENCH: You're not running this meeting.

CHAIR SAVINO: I'm running this meeting, I hope. Am I running this meeting?
Good. Okay what I wanna do at this time – we have with these numbers – let's have – let's get back to our meeting here, please.

MS. ANTLE: I'm listening.

MS. PULSIFER: We're trying to sort this here to prioritize.

CHAIR SAVINO: What I wanna do is I wanna go down through the ones that are obvious according to the rating and I'm gonna entertain a motion to – on that particular project and we move and we vote on it; then go on to the next one. Okay?

I'm gonna ask one more time and then I'm gonna – I don't think it takes three people up there. Rebecca will you please have a seat.

MS. ANTLE: This should get it. Now you should get the right to re-sort it. Did it work?

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, here we go. I'd like to entertain a motion for –

MS. HERNBRODE: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR SAVINO: I'll make the first motion and get it going. I move that the Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund approve funding for the Coconino National Forest Red Rock Ranger District Stoneman Lake Apache Mead OHV Area improvements. I'd like to make that motion that RTP – let's see now – RTP monies – funding for \$130,000 be used for this and \$20,000 from the OHV Recreation Fund.

MR. PFEIFER: I'd like to second that.

CHAIR SAVINO: It's been moved and seconded. All those in favor?

MR. FRENCH: Aye.

MR. PFEIFER: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: Rebecca?

MS. ANTLE: Yes, I said aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, so that's been approved. Okay? You wanna take the next one, Pete?

MS. HERNBRODE: Mr. Chairman you could, if you have some agreement on say the first five or something like that and you're not messing with the numbers, you could do them as a batch if you'd like to move this along a little bit; or you could do them one-by-one. Either way it's legally acceptable.

CHAIR SAVINO: I have the four, there's agreement – there may be agreement on. Is there agreement on the second one? Let me just survey the group real quick. On number two project which is the Tonto National Forest Desert Vista project. Is everybody in agreement with that?

MR. FRENCH: Is that number one on our list?

CHAIR SAVINO: It's number on our – your sheet. Okay. Number three project I have listed is the Coconino National Forest the Munds Park OHV Area Improvements.

CHORUS OF VOICES: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Everybody okay with those three?

CHORUS OF VOICES: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay and number four – excuse me – is – would be the BLM Strip, Arizona BLM Strip. Okay?

MS. ANTLE: Which one is that one?

MR. PFEIFER: It's the second one at the end.

CHAIR SAVINO: That's the second to the last.

MS. HERNBRODE: It's officially numbered ten.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes, number ten project. Okay, do we have okay on those?

CHORUS OF VOICES: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: With that said, then those three projects – do we have to spell those out or just say the project numbers?

MS. HERNBRODE: If you're accepting the – the OHV and RTP funding which I'm assuming you're percentage is there, then I would just list out those projects – you know, your motion would be – and whoever makes it can just say, "I so move," so listen carefully.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MS. HERNBRODE: Your motion would be to approve funding for – let me see if I can do this – Tonto National Forest, CCRD, Desert Vista Trail System Phase I; Coconino National Forest Flagstaff RD, Munds Park OHV Area Improvements – I'm gonna flip back and forth, I apologize – and BLM Arizona Strip Travel Management Plan Implementation in the amounts listed on the form.

CHORUS OF VOICES: So moved.

CHAIR SAVINO: Is there a second to that?

MR. FRENCH: Second.

CHAIR SAVINO: So second moved. All those in favor?

CHORUS OF VOICES: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: Unanimous. So we've done that. So we're gonna go on to number five now. There's a problem with five. I'm not gonna – myself – how many of those voted for it because I have down here, "I don't recommend funding for this project because I don't feel the State OHV Project Fund should be going towards providing funding for two seasonal hires that are federal employees. Also I don't feel that these employees will be working 100 percent of the time on OHV-

related issues since their supervisor will be multi-tasking.” Now I’m sure that I’m gonna get in some issues on that – or did you even hear me?

MS. HERNBRODE: Mr. Chairman you’re talking about the Tonto National Forest CCRD, Desert Vista Claire Management –

CHAIR SAVINO: Number two project, yes.

MS. HERNBRODE: . . . Presence Project. Okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right. I’m talking about that number two even though it rated number five I’m recommending – I’m gonna make a motion. I move that we hold off on funding on the Tonto National Forest Cave Creek Ranger District Desert Vista St. Claire Management Presence for the reasons I just noted – duly noted.

MR. FRENCH: Second.

CHAIR SAVINO: It’s seconded by Don French. All those in favor?

MR. PFEIFER: Aye.

MR. FRENCH: Aye.

MS. ANTLE: I’m not sure.

CHAIR SAVINO: Three ayes and one abstain or no?

MS. ANTLE: I’ll abstain.

CHAIR SAVINO: Abstain. So it’s voted through, so, we’ve gotten that. Okay, six – the sixth project on that list – correct me if I’m wrong – is the American Conservation Experience.

MR. FRENCH: It’s nine on our sheet?

CHAIR SAVINO: It’s number nine on the sheet. Does anybody have any problems with funding that? No?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Do you or don’t you? You’re shaking your head, but

MS. ANTLE: Well it comes down and rates okay, but I – I just never really agreed with funding wilderness from a motorized stand, but –

CHAIR SAVINO: But what? Please state your – if you object well then state it.

MS. ANTLE: If it helps in education and keeping people off where they don’t belong then I suppose it’s okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, so you agree with it then?

MS. ANTLE: Barely.

[Laughter.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, you’re okay with this?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: So then I'm gonna go forward with it then if it's okay with you. I move to fund – fund Project American Conservation Experience, the Mazatzal Wilderness Boundary Signing for both – no this is just a – money from the RTP Funding.

MR. FRENCH: Second.

CHAIR SAVINO: Seconded by Don French. All those in favor.

MR. FRENCH: Aye.

MR. PFEIFER: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: Rebecca?

MS. ANTLE: Uhmmmm –

CHAIR SAVINO: It doesn't matter. Just say no.

MS. ANTLE: Yeah, yeah. They're not longer a part of our group, but yeah, okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay so unanimous. Okay we've got that one. Number seven, Maricopa County Parks, the Vulture Mine.

MR. FRENCH: Which is eight?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah. This one I have an objection to. What I have down, "I recommend holding off on this funding until the BLM has completed their travel management plan," or whatever the right nomenclature for that is – terminology – "for this area until it is approved for motorized area.

MR. PFEIFER: How soon do you think that will happen?

CHAIR SAVINO: When – Bill – Mr. Gibson, do you – when do you feel this is gonna happen?

MR. GIBSON: The Wickenburg Travel Management Plan is due to be signed by September 30th of this year.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. How can this work out, Joy, on – if we approve it, can we also recommend that the funding be held and contingent on that approval or that plan? Or, how do we do this?

MS. HERNBRODE: Mr. Chairman, if I remember correctly what they said at the last meeting was that their application indicated that they had connecting routes already approved.

CHAIR SAVINO: They didn't. They don't. Your BLM Representative is shaking his head.

MS. HERNBRODE: Okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: The fact that they don't. They said but they really don't. Until that travel management plan is in existence – well, how would you rather – I'm

asking you again how would you rather have us handle it? Have it tabled until then or –

MR. PFEIFER: Yeah, we like the project but at the same time we don't want to spend money on something that may not happen.

CHAIR SAVINO: And can we – Bob, if you can jump in here – because if we approve it and that money sits there and they don't get the approval, then that's a moot point. That money'll come back into the fund. If it is approved, then at least – what we've accomplished is we've tied that money up so we've accomplished – we put it towards a project where –

MR. BALDWIN: [Unintelligible]. They know that it's there.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah.

MR. BALDWIN: But then they don't have to go back through the application process.

CHAIR SAVINO: So we should. If we wanna approve it we should approve it then.

MR. BALDWIN: You could approve it pending ratification of completion of –

MR. GIBSON: Final completion of the Wickenburg Travel Management Plan.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MR. BALDWIN: And that's a signature decision.

MR. GIBSON: And that's a signature decision.

MR. BALDWIN: Signature decision by BLM concerning the Wickenburg –

MR. GIBSON: Travel management plan.

MR. BALDWIN: . . . travel management plan.

CHAIR SAVINO: You have all that?

REPORTER: It's on the tape.

[Laughter.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, good. Then what they just said – what Bob said –

MS. HERNBRODE: May I re-state Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

MS. HERNBRODE: So you're going to approve Maricopa County Parks Vulture Mountain Regional OHV Parks Environmental Assessment contingent upon the signature approval of the BLM on the Wickenburg –

MR. GIBSON: Travel Management Plan.

MS. HERNBRODE: . . . Travel Management Plan.

CHAIR SAVINO: So moved.

MR. PFEIFER: I second it.

CHAIR SAVINO: Seconded by Pete Pfeifer. All those in favor?

CHORUS OF VOICES: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: So it's been approved so that one's approved. Now we go to number eight which I have down there as the Kingman.

MS. HERNBRODE: Number five.

CHAIR SAVINO: Which is number five – one, two, three, four -- five on your list. I'll make the motion on my role. I move that we – that the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group recommend funding for the BLM Kingman Field Office Route Evaluations. This money will be coming -- \$30,000 will be – will come from the OHV Recreation Fund. Is there a second to that motion?

MR. PFEIFER: I'll second it.

CHAIR SAVINO: Pete seconds it. All those in favor?

MR. PFEIFER: Aye.

MS. ANTLE: Aye.

MR. FRENCH: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: It's unanimous. That's taken off there, so, let's go on to number nine.

MS. ANTLE: Number six.

CHAIR SAVINO: What?

MS. ANTLE: Number nine is number six.

CHAIR SAVINO: Or it can be number three can't it?

MS. ANTLE: Actually yes. Both of those are the same.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, so – since I'm giving the motion I'm gonna go with number three.

MS. ANTLE: Okay. Yes sir!

CHAIR SAVINO: So, I – well somebody else make this motion. Please? Pete, please?

MR. PFEIFER: Okay I'd like to make the motion to approve the TMP Implementation Maps and Signs Project for the BLM Havasu Field Office and – I'm not sure what the monies are.

CHAIR SAVINO: The monies are – if I may interrupt – is \$97,000 will be coming from the RTP Funds and \$6,000 from the OHV Recreation Funds.

MR. PFEIFER: Okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: Is there a second on that?

MR. FRENCH: Second.

CHAIR SAVINO: Seconded by Don French. All those in favor?

CHORUS OF VOICES: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: It's been approved. Okay now Don will you read the next one which was tied with that, which is the third project.

MR. FRENCH: I move to fund the White Mountain Open Trails Association Snowflake Motorsports Park Environmental Impact Study for the amount of –

CHAIR SAVINO: Hundred and thirty thousand.

MR. FRENCH: Hundred and thirty thousand.

CHAIR SAVINO: That will come out of the OHV Funds. Is there – I'll second it – or Pete will second it.

MR. PFEIFER: I'll second it.

CHAIR SAVINO: All those in favor say aye.

CHORUS OF VOICES: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: Rebecca? You didn't say either way. Please just say yes or not or abstain.

MS. ANTLE: Abstain.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, she's abstaining. Okay we're going on to number 10 which –

MS. HERNBRODE: Mr. Chairman I believe you're on actually the last project.

CHAIR SAVINO: What?

MS. ANTLE: All right.

MS. HERNBRODE: Seven.

CHAIR SAVINO: Eleven.

MS. HERNBRODE: Seven – which would actually be the –

CHAIR SAVINO: Oh I see – okay, yea, yea, yea – it's the seven. One, two, three, four – seven – the eleventh project I would like – I will more – here, I'm gonna give my reasons why. I'm gonna survey the group first. I'm surveying – it came up with two points total. Arizona Game and Fish already received over \$1.3 million of OHV Recreation Funds. That amount is nearly as much as the State Parks OHV Project Fund money total. They should use some of their own funding for this project. That's my reasonings behind it. Is there any other reasons why? Somebody could state.

MR. FRENCH: I don't understand exactly what this survey is doing and what we're gonna accomplish for it, so I'm not –

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay so then we put that in there too, that we don't understand what this is – exactly what it's doing. It wasn't clear.

MR. FRENCH: Right. Enforcement strategy.

MR. PFEIFER: It's not real clear to me what the benefits would be to the users themselves, the people paying into the fund.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay so that is duly noted and that will be put in there. So with that said I'd –

MR. PFEIFER: I would like to second your motion – or have you made one yet?

[Laughter.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay I move that the OHV Funds deny the funding for the Arizona Game and Fish Department Statewide OHV Access Use Impact Survey.

MS. HERNBRODE: Mr. Chairman, before you get a second, because you feel that the Game and Fish Department received other funding from the OHV Funds –

CHAIR SAVINO: Well that's [unintelligible]. She has all that down. She's just gonna –

MS. HERNBRODE: I'm putting it in your motion here for you.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, thank you.

MR. FRENCH: And also I'd like to add because it rated so low.

MS. HERNBRODE: Okay so you have three reasons why you're denying funding for this. The first one is because – because they already get OHV money. The second one is because you don't understand what the purposes of this survey is and what the benefit will be to the users. And the third reason is because it scored so low.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, sounds good. What we've done then is we've taken in –

MS. HERNBRODE: Actually we need to take a vote. We need to take a vote.

CHAIR SAVINO: Oh, I'm sorry. Do we have a second?

MR. PFEIFER: I'll second it.

CHAIR SAVINO: Seconded by Pete. All those in favor?

CHORUS OF VOICES: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: Now we're okay. Thank you. Ah, gosh! What we've essentially done, we've taken project number two and project number seven out of the picture. Those two are the ones that we do not recommend. All the rest of 'em will be recommended for funding. Now I have a question, Bob. You had stated in a couple meetings ago – in the minutes – where this doesn't – unlike in the past these – this doesn't have to go in front of the State Parks Board anymore for approval? That it's just approved?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman and group, we're under the same direction of the Parks Board, select and approve projects for funding, that we have been on since 2010.

CHAIR SAVINO: Then why did you make that comment to us?

MR. BALDWIN: About what?

CHAIR SAVINO: I will get – hang tight real quick and I will get it.

MS. HERNBRODE: Mr. Chairman. He agreed with you.

CHAIR SAVINO: He did?

MS. HERNBRODE: Yeah.

CHAIR SAVINO: No he didn't.

MR. FRENCH: Yes he did.

CHAIR SAVINO: Did he?

MR. FRENCH: Yeah.

CHAIR SAVINO: Did he approve 'em? Because no – what I'm stating is that – I just wanna know which way do we do. Are we going in front of the Parks Board with these recommendations?

MS. HERNBRODE: Mr. Chairman, the Parks Board direction, right, at this point is that you are the approval body. You have done so.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. So we've done it so it's done.

MS. HERNBRODE: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Good. I'm getting -- it's getting oh, long, drawn out – anything else? Staff reports – okay at this time I'm gonna – can we – I'd like to call for adjournment of this – entertain a motion for adjournment.

MR. PFEIFER: I would like to make the motion that we adjourn.

MR. FRENCH: Second.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman we have another item on the agenda. Do you want to decide how you deal with that?

CHAIR SAVINO: Gosh! Please no. Which one, OHVAG will review the grant rating process and staff recommendation to include OHVAG Ambassador Program Projects?

MR. BALDWIN: We don't have another grant cycle until you can tell me how you wanna do this?

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay what we did – at this time – I thought I did this earlier, but apparently I didn't. We held off on it. I'd like to entertain a motion to hold off on the grant cycle for this next period – this next quarter meeting – help me here.

MS. HERNBRODE: The question, Mr. Chairman, is that in order to do a grant cycle you have to come up with the criteria. The criteria -- coming up with a criteria was on the agenda for today. So do you want to set another meeting where you're going to come up with a criteria?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes what we'd like to do is this meeting – our next meeting – I would like to make our next meeting – which is August 17, location to be determined. Here, I imagine. We just have it here. I'd like to have that meeting be a workshop to deal with this grant-rating form.

MR. PFEIFER: Can we move it to another date?

CHAIR SAVINO: All right. We're talking about moving it to another date. Hang on.

MS. ANTLE: Is it possible to go the week prior?

CHAIR SAVINO: I don't know. I don't have my calendar with me. I'd like to have – Doris, can you put out a doodle on this for the next meeting?

MS. PULSIFER: For the week before August?

MS. ANTLE: A week before would be wonderful.

CHAIR SAVINO: A week before, 'cause I don't know how everybody else –

MS. ANTLE: Yes because I can do that.

MR. PFEIFER: The first week in August?

MS. ANTLE: Well it was the 17th – was the original date.

MS. PULSIFER: The second week in August.

MS. ANTLE: Yeah, whatever the second week – I think it's the weekend of the 11th, so it would probably be the 10th – either the 11th or the 10th is that Friday.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, but send it out to make sure that the rest of the members can make it because I know that if you're around the 11th David Moore won't be in – while I'm at it, Bob. David Moore put in his application for –

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and group, we haven't announced applications for new positions at this time.

CHAIR SAVINO: No, but this wasn't an announcement, this was something that was carried over from before. All he had to do [unintelligible] from before, wasn't it? Or does he have to –

MR. BALDWIN: He has been extended – in the March 21st Parks board meeting they extended him until the end of the year.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. All right. So with that said, I'd like to call for an adjournment. So, this meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

MS. HERNBRODE: Mr. Chairman, I encourage you to be nice to Paul or whatever poor AG comes at the next meeting 'cause it won't be me. I'll be busy.

[Meeting adjourned at 5:55 pm.]